JUNE 1953 PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—The Historical Truth of the Gospels—To What Extent Has Doctrine Moulded the Tradition?—Professor Greenslade on Schism in the Early Church—Some Reflections on Christian Unity 257

II. BOOKS ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST: JAMES DENNEY'S 'JESUS AND THE GOSPEL.' By Professor J. E. L. Oulton, D.D., The University of Dublin 259

III. LITERATURE 262

IV. CHRISTIAN BELIEF IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE. By Professor William Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., Butler University, Indianapolis 268

V. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 273
2. The Christian Year 274

VI. THE DATE OF LUKE–ACTS. By the Reverend C. S. C. Williams, M.A., Merton College, Oxford 283

VII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 284

VIII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. The Present Participle of Antecedent Action—Some New Testament Instances. By Principal H. G. Meecham, M.A., D.D., Ph.D., Hartley Victoria College, Manchester . 285
2. ἐβάπτισα in Mark i. 8. By the Reverend F. J. Botha, B.A., B.D., West Krugersdorp, South Africa 286

XI. ENTRE NOUS—Religious Education: The Early Training of Children in Prayer and Worship.
1. Laying the Foundations—'One of God's Merry Men' 286

VOLUME LXIV. No. 9

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

New Books

The Bible Doctrine of Sin

By C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D. — 20s. *net*

An English book on this subject has been long overdue, and we believe Dr. Ryder Smith has filled this gap.

The Pilgrim Church

The First Five Years of the Church of South India

By A. MARCUS WARD, M.A. — *Paper covers,* 8s. 6d. *net; Cloth covers,* 10s. 6d. *net*

No more striking or encouraging portent has occured in the Church Universal during the last years than the appearing of the Church of South India, in which, for the first time in history, an episcopal Church has joined with non-episcopal Churches to form a new and living whole.

Still They Are Talking

By LEONARD C. HORWOOD — 5s. *net*

Studies for the chief festivals of the Church's year by an outstanding New Zealand preacher.

"These are good sermons. Preachers will find in them new lines of approach to the Christian festivals."—*Church of England Newspaper.*

"A handbook of the deepest theology in the simplest words."—*The Christian.*

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

THE

BIBLICAL DOCTRINE

OF

INFANT BAPTISM

by Pierre Ch. Marcel

Translated by Philip E. Hughes

There are few questions more widely discussed in theological circles at the present time than that of infant baptism. This refreshing study, written from a conservative theological standpoint by a distinguished French scholar, fills a long-felt want.

The author is a Pastor of the French Reformed Church, Vice-President of the Calvinist Society of France and a lecturer in the Free Faculty of Theology in the University of Paris.

15s. net

From all booksellers

JAMES CLARKE & CO. LTD., 5 WARDROBE PLACE, LONDON, E.C.4

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

SIGNS are not wanting that the next subject for serious debate in New Testament criticism will be the character and extent of the historical element in the earliest tradition. Ever since the publication of Professor Lightfoot's 'History and Interpretation in the Gospels' in 1935 the prevailing tendency has been to recognize the extent to which doctrine has moulded the tradition. Indeed, it would not be too much to say that in the older Universities interpretation rather than history is recognized in the tradition. The historical element is not denied, but interest in the main is taken in the manner in which the Evangelists have used the tradition, coupled with a certain doubt whether we can penetrate far behind the Gospel writers to the testimony of the original eye-witnesses. Thus, Dr. Austin Farrer, in 'A Study in St. Mark,' a volume which in some quarters has been received with rapturous applause, sees the Gospel tradition arranged in typological patterns. The Archbishop of Quebec, in 'The Primitive Christian Calendar,' sees a liturgical interest at work in the arrangement of the material in Mark according to an early Christian calendar, and in his stimulating work, 'The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel,' Professor C. H. DODD frankly confesses that he regards the Fourth Gospel as being in its essential character a theological work rather than a history.

It is perhaps not likely that we shall return to an appraisal of the Gospel tradition like that made familiar to us by William Sanday, F. C. Burkitt, and B. H. Streeter, but it is a justifiable query whether modern New Testament scholars, strongly influenced by W. Wrede, J. Wellhausen, W. Bousset, and R. Bultmann, are not indulging to a dangerous degree a sense of critical freedom, sustained by a living belief in our knowledge of the primitive Christian *kerygma*. To what extent does a belief in the validity of the Church provide a basis for critical scepticism? Contemptuous of the Liberal Jesus School, how far can we be sure that the problems which the Liberals faced are relatively unimportant? It is obvious that these issues must sooner or later be faced by a competent New Testament scholar, and it is pleasing to record that this has been attempted by Professor H. E. W. TURNER, Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham, in his scholarly and intensely interesting volume, *Jesus, Master and Lord*.[1] Thorough, positive, lucid, and well-informed, this work is all the more welcome because, in the present juncture, it is written by an Anglican scholar.

Professor TURNER clearly indicates his aim by the sub-title of his book—'A Study in the Historical Truth of the Gospels.' He writes for theological students, teachers in schools, and working clergy and ministers, who may wish for a reliable and straightforward guide to the mass of recent work done by critical scholars on the Gospels. For once, at least, we may agree with the statement on the publisher's cover, 'There is no single book which offers these results in convenient form,' adding, however, that this book is now available in Professor TURNER'S volume. Against Form Critics he emphasizes the importance of eye-witnesses. He maintains that Jesus meant His teaching to be remembered, and to this end cast it into a readily memorable form, denies that the Evangelists were uninterested in matters of time and place, and rejects the idea that Mark wrote with an elaborate and conscious 'plot.' 'Dr. Farrer,' he says, 'sees Mark in one way, I in another. On the whole the character of the book does not suggest a complicated figure with great literary ingenuity. There is certainly simplicity and vividness. He tells a story well and to the point, but does his mind really move in such a complicated way? I hardly think that future ages will believe that it did.'

Professor TURNER explains that his defence of the fundamental historicity of the Gospel tradition is not offered as the explanation of all the difficulties, and admits that there are many questions we should like to ask about the life of Jesus to which no certain answer can be given. His defence, he explains, is offered 'to challenge the mood of historical pessimism which has come of late years over historical criticism,' and to prepare the way for a valuable outline reconstruction, which he courageously gives, of the life of Christ. Important discussions follow concerning the Person of Christ, His teaching, and 'the conclusion of the whole matter,' which he finds in

[1] Mowbray; 21s. net.

the Resurrection. He leaves the Nature miracles ' in a kind of theological " suspense account," ' and one might wish that in this matter, as well as regards the Virgin Birth, he had been able to write more explicitly. He is more than suspicious of attempts to give a communal interpretation to the idea of ' the Son of Man,' and questions C. H. Dodd's excessive emphasis upon ' realized eschatology.' In particular he thinks that Dodd's interpretation of the principle of judgment ' would be what the teaching of Jesus amounted to as seen through Greek, or even through modern, eyes,' but doubts whether it is what Jesus actually meant. He has many wise things to say about the teaching of Jesus, pointing out, as regards Pacifism, that ' to surrender our own rights is one thing, to surrender the rights of others is to surrender what it is not ours to give,' and acutely observing with reference to divorce that ' an age like our own, which too often sees marriage in the context of divorce, has much to learn from our Lord's insistence on seeing divorce rather in the context of marriage.' Altogether, this book is one of the most rewarding discussions of recent times, and it may unreservedly be recommended to readers who want to see their way more clearly through modern Gospel problems.

Professor S. L. Greenslade, D.D., of Durham, is widely and deservedly esteemed both in and beyond his own Anglican Communion. He is eminent as a Patristic scholar and has few equals in his knowledge of the history of the Church. His latest work is one which we hope will command wide attention—*Schism in the Early Church*.[1]

He treats the subject in a most illuminating way. Instead of giving a detailed account of each major schism he deals rather with the causes of schism and the steps taken to heal the breaches. On the latter point he is convinced that by the method of persecution, while the Orthodox sometimes secured victory, it meant that ' in the long run, the damage to Christianity has been immeasurably great.'

We should like, however, to deal more particularly with Chapter xi.—' Some Reflections on Christian Unity.' It is highly relevant to the problems of ecumenicity which occupy so many minds and have produced such a flow of books in recent times.

The author begins by discussing in what sense the Church torn asunder as she is may be said to be a unity despite divisions. Some hold that the true Church is invisible and no so-called Church is identical with it. The unity of the visible Church is therefore a secondary, though not necessarily an unimportant issue. The answer to that is that the invisible and the visible Church are not two separate entities and that it was to the Church visible that St. Paul attributed unity and holiness. Visible breaches of that unity are sin, which hinders the world from knowing ' that Thou didst send me and lovedst them.'

Others hold that unity is to be understood spiritually not institutionally and it persists through institutional divisions wherever Christians meet to worship God in Christ. But this is at best only a half-truth. Christian disunity cannot be concealed under a plea that we are all Christian brothers. Then separation one from another at Holy Communion focuses our spiritual disunion or at least hinders our unity and ' to acquiesce in this is plain sin.' We ought not to be content with less than full inter-communion, and surely we can reach that without waiting for complete re-union of Christians.

But how may ' churches ' be recognized as worthy of the name ? With what other ' denominations ' may one who is convinced of the catholicity of his own have fellowship ? First, who should be recognized as a minister ?—one who has responded to the call of God and been duly authorized by the ecclesiastical person or body to whom officially he is subordinate. Then what makes a body of worshipping Christians a church ? Any denomination should be acknowledged to be a church if it preaches the gospel on the basis of the Bible, affirms the truth of the two venerable Creeds, uses the two Sacraments, solemnly sets apart men to be ordained through the prayers of the Church represented by ordained ministers, produces the fruits of the Spirit and has shown its power to survive. ' Then we ought to assume that Christ has given it a ministry endowed with His own authority and we ought to acknowledge it to be within the *Una Sancta*.'

In denominations which on such a basis acknowledge each other to be sister-churches there ought to be intercommunion between them and the possibility of an ordered though not indiscriminate interchange of ministers. ' I am not content to say there could be intercommunion. No, there should be, it is wrong if there is not ; there is enough unity of spirit to demand it, and to be injured if it is refused.' ' As regards many of the major denominations of Christendom I cannot but record my conviction that not to recognize each other as sister-churches, with whatever faults, is spiritual blindness. We ought to be in communion with one another, the case against it is not good enough. Is not God calling us to have the courage and faith and humility to take this step ? '

[1] S.C.M. ; 21s. net.

Books on the Person of Christ

James Denney's 'Jesus and the Gospel'

By Professor J. E. L. Oulton, D.D., The University of Dublin

The *format* of this book will be a reminder to many of us of a spaciousness in publishing which is now a thing of the past. In this handsome volume before us there are nearly four hundred and fifty pages in all, with an ample margin and printed in a type and manner which is a joy to those of us who regret the pinched and compressed methods forced upon a reading public by conditions prevailing to-day.

The main object with which *Jesus and the Gospel* appears to have been written also suggests a generation other than our own. Obviously the deniers of the truth of Christianity belong to no one age; and to take up the challenge against such cannot in any sense 'date' an author. But while Denney has these in mind, his chief opponents would seem to be minimizers of Christianity, or those who refuse to take it seriously; and it may be doubted if these classes of persons are so commonly met with to-day among the public who read books on religion of a serious character. Edwyn Bevan (*Hellenism and Christianity*, 267), writing in 1921, later indeed than Denney but in a not dissimilar situation, speaks of a comparison of the Liberal theologians of his day to 'men sitting in a slowly heated room, who divested themselves of garment after garment, discussing the while what minimum decency compelled them to keep on.' Somewhat similarly, Denney quotes Schmiedel from the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* for the affirmation that there are (only) five passages in the Gospels, namely, Mk 10^{17} 3^{21}, Mt 12^{32}, Mk 13^{32} 15^{34}, which could be called the foundation pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus. The selection of these texts would certainly be called in question to-day as a sufficient basis for forming an estimate concerning any historical person, not to speak of the Person known to the Christian faith as Jesus of Nazareth. A different 'climate' obtains now in historical criticism of Christianity, which is, on the whole, more favourable to the Christian Creed than that of the minimizers of Denney's generation. He, however, wrote for his own day, and effectively witnessed for an historical basis of the faith more secure and adequate than the liberalism which in his opinion was unjustified by the facts and insufficient for a Christian conception of Christ.

Denney's style is too well known to readers of The Expository Times to require a lengthy description. It is the style of a writer who formed it principally in the pulpit and the lecture room, that is, a style directed towards an audience and consequently forcible and pointed. Though in substance scholarly, his method of expression lacks the economy and precision that we associate with the scholar pure and simple; and it is equally removed from the style of a literary essay. In other words, the style is justified by its impact upon the reader. The author knows what he has to say, who his readers will be, and how he wishes to impress them. The form is excellent when the object in view is remembered.

Jesus and the Gospel consists of two unequal parts. Part I (a hundred and four pages) exhibits the place of Christ as stated in New Testament Faith; Part II discusses whether this place is that which He claimed for Himself (p. 107 to the end). Obviously Part I presents Denney with the easier task, the subject being 'Does the New Testament throughout give that solitary and all-determining place to Jesus which He holds in the later Christian religion?' And the first question to be discussed in this Part is: Is the New Testament in this respect consistent with itself? or, Are there differences and variety within the New Testament which prevent a clear answer being given to the question which Part I sets out to answer? It is to the credit of Denney that he recognizes and admits, unlike some moderns, *both* a unity and a variety in the New Testament. He is familiar with, and does not altogether discount, the 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode' of his day which regarded the New Testament as a supreme example of religious syncretism, from which it must be purged if we are to reach Christianity in its purity. It is plain that Denney, though he thinks that this method 'like all new things is apt to go to some heads with intoxicating power,' is prepared to go some way with it, and probably further than if he had lived to-day and seen more clearly its weakness. But he maintains, nevertheless, that this variety is the very means of establishing his thesis. What is the vital force which triumphs over all these differences? How came it about that the several writers of the New Testament were conscious of an indissoluble spiritual bond? 'There can be no doubt that that which unites them is a common relation to Christ—a common faith in Him

involving common religious convictions about Him.'

Denney then proceeds to justify this statement by an appeal to the several writers of the New Testament. This is a competent piece of work, carried out succinctly because it is only a prelude to the longer and more controversial Part II, which forms the main subject of the book. The difficulties arising in relation to the doctrine of Christ from the recorded speeches of St. Peter in the early chapters of Acts are skilfully met. Schmiedel had fastened on the undeveloped character of their Christology in observing that it is hardly possible not to believe that it must have come from a primitive source. Denney replies that it is important to notice that from the very first there was a Christology, but that it is the religious significance of Jesus, rather than the Christology of Peter, which it is his purpose to exhibit, and that for Peter Jesus was both Lord and Christ. On the whole, however, we are left with the impression that Denney has parried rather than met the problem. On the other hand, the centrality of Christ and His absolute significance for Christians, as evidenced by the Epistles and Revelation, is clearly and convincingly manifested.

Before passing on to Part II, there is an important ' bridge ' passage (p. 102) in which Denney displays a balanced perspective which is as important for our day and outlook as it was for his. He points out that on the one hand there are historically minded persons who urge us to get back to Jesus, but the Jesus whom they profess to discover is not the Jesus of the Christian religion but a pious, humble, good man, who called others to trust the Father as He trusted, and to be children of God like Him. On the other hand, there are those who invite us to dismiss historical considerations as irrelevant. The latter class are not unlike the ' neo-orthodox ' and ' post-critical ' school of to-day, who appear to suppose that the results of a century of critical examination of the Gospels can be by-passed. Denney, rightly, will have none of this. ' There is a theory of religion, of history, and of reality in general, implied alike in the philosophical appeal which would give us a Christianity without Jesus, and in the historical one which would give us a Jesus who could take no responsibility for anything that has ever been called Christian. The writer has no such confidence in either theory as would justify him in assenting off-hand to the stupendous impeachment of Providence which is implied in both.' It is significant that Dr. Vincent Taylor in our day (*The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, 25) has also wise words to say concerning the folly indulged in by some members of the ' post-critical ' school. But clearly Denney in his day was more largely concerned with the views of the historical school which could give nothing but a ' reduced ' Christianity scarcely recognizable by the ordinary orthodox believer. And it is mainly, though by no means solely, against such a view that Denney devotes the second and much larger portion of his work.

Part II, ' The Historical Basis of the Christian Faith ' opens with a lengthy discussion of the Resurrection of Jesus (pp. 108–159). This, on the whole, is a first-rate piece of work. At the outset Denney deals faithfully with Harnack's distinction between the Easter Faith—the conviction of the victory of Jesus over death—and the Easter Message, which deals with the empty grave, the appearances to the disciples, and so forth. ' To say that the faith produced the message—that Jesus rose again in the souls of His disciples, in their resurgent faith and love, and that this, and this alone, gave birth to all the stories of the empty grave and the appearances of the Lord to His own —is to pronounce a purely dogmatic judgment. What underlies it is not the historical evidence as the documents enable us to reach it, but an estimate of the situation dictated by a philosophical theory which has discounted the evidence beforehand.' At the same time Denney strongly deprecates a merely literalistic approach to the evangelical accounts of the Resurrection. ' It ought to be apparent that, so far as the fact of the resurrection of Jesus is concerned, the narratives of the evangelists are quite the least important part of the evidence with which we have to deal. . . . The real historical evidence for the resurrection is the fact that it was believed, preached, propagated and produced its fruit and effect in the new phenomenon of the Christian Church, long before any of our gospels were written.' But he will not allow, on the evidence either of the Gospels or of the Epistles, that there was a self-begotten Easter Faith which produced the Easter Message in the way of self-support and self-defence.

But the testimony to the Resurrection is not merely historical testimony: there are, in fact, three ways in which it is morally conditioned. First, it is the resurrection of *Jesus*—of a Being of incomparable moral worth and significance. Secondly, the Resurrection, as preached by the disciples, was a *gospel*, involving victory in the ultimate issue over sin and death, and a proclamation concerning the forgiveness of sin and a final judgment. Thirdly, ' from the very beginning men were persuaded that the resurrection was a fact, because they saw it operating with moral power.' These particular pages (122–131) are well worth re-reading, and not least to-day, when it has to be emphasized, in opposition to bare authoritarianism, that the subjective has its place, even in belief in the Resurrection.

In the view of the writer of this article, the discussion of the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection is not of equal value. The treatment is somewhat hesitating and unconvincing, even when we note, as we have already done, that Denney does not base his main argument upon them. We certainly lack here the insight which made H. Latham's *The Risen Master* so suggestive in its thesis that in these accounts the historical data point us to something beyond what is merely historical.

The remainder of the book—which is, in fact, numerically the greater portion of it—is concerned with the self-revelation of Jesus as it is found in the Gospels, or rather—for this is what it comes to in actual fact—in Mark and Q. All throughout this section Denney confronts the minimizers of the evangelical accounts of Jesus, particularly J. Weiss ; and he has no difficulty in showing that critics of this sort assume beforehand that Jesus cannot really have the place in the relations of God to man which the primitive Church assigned Him, and therefore everything in the Gospels which is congruous with that place must have some other explanation than that it is true ; in other words that the evangelists must have a bad case. But why, asks Denney, should not the evangelists, or the primitive Church for which they wrote, have a good case ? Why must it have been something else than reality which made them give to Jesus the place they did ? Surely the probabilities lie the other way—that some extraordinary reality lies behind all this. And so ' it is with this prejudice, rather than with the opposite one, that we think it reasonable to approach the investigation of a question which can never be less than vital to those who have been educated in Christian faith.'

Had Denney been writing his book to-day he could have drawn with profit upon the results (if such they may be styled) of source-criticism which were not available in 1908. He places Q, for example, about the year 60, and this would now seem to be a decade too late. Again, he might have made more use of the Third Gospel if he had been acquainted with the Proto-Luke theory and, in consequence, with the early date of the material known as L. In other words, he would have found in these documents more primitive records than they were commonly regarded in his day. And this would have affected his treatment of this portion of his book, inasmuch as he confessedly relies mainly upon materials which he believes to be nearest the times which they profess to record. On the other hand, Denney might less confidently have relied upon the Papias tradition concerning Matthew, or to the view that behind Matthew lies an Aramaic document written by the Apostle of that name. And he would have been obliged to have given due weight to the science (if it may so be called) of Form-criticism, which may be said to have taken its origin in *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* of Martin Dibelius, which appeared in 1919. From this study, however, it by no means follows that he need have drawn negative conclusions. On the balance, certainly, his task in maintaining this portion of his thesis would have been easier.

It is more difficult to appraise generally this section of the book, since it consists of discussions of several passages in the Gospels, and all of these are clearly not of equal value or cogency. But even if we were to hold that Denney's peculiar powers are not seen at their highest in detailed exegesis (as we noted above in the case of the Resurrection narratives), the cumulative effect of his remarks is considerable. If we accept his starting point, which seems reasonable enough, that we must not treat, *a priori*, the sayings of Jesus about Himself in the Synoptic Gospels as improbably true, the result of the sayings taken together is deeply impressive, and again and again Denney presses home this point well and forcibly.

It is probable that few, if any, works on the Person of Christ have been written with so little reference to technical statements on Christology and in particular to conciliar definitions of the Church. It is plain that Denney set no great store by these. ' Very few people can tell what Athanasius and the Nicene bishops meant by this term ' (*sc.* ' consubstantial '). ' There can be no hope of appealing to the world in which we live to give Christ such a place in its faith if we identify doing so with the acceptance beforehand of the inherited Christology of the Church.' ' One may be convinced, as the writer is, that the Arian answer is quite unreal, and as convinced that the Athanasian answer explains nothing.' Denney himself proposes as a basis for acceptance by all Christians the statement ' I believe in God through Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord and Saviour.' To-day the theological climate is somewhat different. We may be convinced that the *mysterium Christi* is indeed a *mysterium* and will always remain so, and yet at the same time acknowledge it to be inevitable that statements and definitions will emerge in the Church in order to guide men to a right faith concerning Christ, or at any rate to deter them from paths that have been found to lead in the wrong direction. And it seems to be possible or even probable that in the future Christians now separated will agree to unite on such a credal basis as that of Nicaea. Moreover, apart from present tendencies or what may happen in the future, it is a fact that Christian thought about Christ did take a certain course as a matter

of history; and thus there is a presupposition in favour of the forecast that supposing the mind of the Church, theologically speaking, could become a *tabula rasa* as concerning the *mysterium Christi*, the need for rational thought would lead again to theological definition, although not necessarily the same precise definition. Further, it can hardly be questioned that in the New Testament itself the material is found upon which the more rationalized conceptions of the fourth and fifth centuries were based.

This is not to decry the value of *Jesus and the Gospel*, but rather to recognize its limitations. And we would end on a note of gratitude that Denney provided his day and generation with a book which, on the one hand, maintains throughout it a vigorous criticism of a tendency then only too common to reduce Christianity to its lowest terms, and, on the other, to set forth with unmistakable clearness the place given to Christ in the primitive Church and ever since given to Him by the faithful. It is a book which aims first and foremost at presenting the religious values of the Christian faith, and as such will not cease to profit those who live under different modes of thought and in a different kind of world.

Literature

AIDS TO PATRISTIC STUDY

Two further volumes have emerged in 'The Ancient Christian Writers' series published in America by the Newman Press and in England by Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. The first is *The Call of the Nations*, by St. Prosper of Aquitaine, translated by Professor P. De Letter, S.J., and its price is 25s. net. This is a notable addition to the series, because it is the first time this particular work has been done into English. It dates from about A.D. 450. It has been attributed impossibly to Ambrose, and Quesnel, with more reason, claimed it for Leo the Great; but some ten years ago Cappuyns produced cogent reasons why the authorship of Prosper of Aquitaine should stand. Prosper was a champion of the Augustinian doctrine of grace against the semi-Pelagians. The question which Prosper sets out to answer is, 'If God's salvific will is universal—and of this there can be no doubt—how is it that many are not saved, or, as the author prefers to view it, how is it that many do not receive the grace that saves? And inversely, if many are not saved or do not receive the grace that saves, how can there really be in God a universal salvific will?' Prosper's solution is that there are really two kinds of grace. There is general grace which God gives to all men and which is the proof that He does will all men to be saved; but there is special grace which is given only to some and the reason for the discrimination is a mystery beyond our understanding. Prosper is really attempting to reconcile 'a universalist doctrine of the divine salvific will with a theory of election that remains essentially the same as Augustinian predestination.' It cannot be said that Prosper succeeds in his object, but the book is very important because it represents a period when theological thinking saw the defects of the cast-iron Augustinian doctrine of grace and predestination and had not yet the courage to throw off the shackles. The introduction is well done; the translation is clear and the notes are more than adequate.

The second volume is *St. Augustine, Sermons for Christmas and Epiphany*, translated by Mr. Thomas Comerford Lawler, and the price is 25s. net. The volume includes fourteen sermons for Christmas, two for New Year's Day and six for Epiphany. Here we find the 'great mind (of Augustine) bending down, as it were, to nourish with the truths of God the "little ones in the nest of faith."' In the Christmas sermons certain things haunt Augustine. The text, 'Truth sprang out of the earth' (Ps 85^{11}), comes to his lips again and again. Again and again he refers to and insists on the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary. Again and again he insists that Jesus Christ was born of a woman, that woman's first sin in the Garden of Eden might not drive women to despair and men to hatred of women. He deals with the age-old Biblical problems of the difference between the two genealogies of Christ and of the polygamy of the patriarchs. Augustine says many things which are quite out-dated but every now and again there emerges a flash of permanent loveliness. 'The world was subject to Christ—Christ was subject to His parents.' 'He finds no room at the inn, but He builds a temple for Himself in the hearts of those who believe.' He holds that Jesus was born on the shortest day, because with His coming the darkness was gone and the light came for men. In one sermon he has an almost lyrical passage about Christmas Day.

> Rejoice you who are just. It is the birthday of Him who justifies.
> Rejoice you who are weak and sick. It is the birthday of Him who makes well.

Rejoice you who are in captivity. It is the birthday of the Redeemer.
Rejoice you who are slaves. It is the birthday of the Master.
Rejoice you who are free. It is the birthday of Him who makes free.
Rejoice you Christians all. It is Christ's birthday.

Another most interesting and useful volume is *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, Book viii., edited and translated by the Rev. C. S. C. Williams (Blackwell; 10s. 6d. net). The Introduction is notably good, with extremely valuable discussions of Manichaeism and Plotinus and Neo-Platonism. The translation is smooth and good. The notes, though not extensive, are excellent.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

BENTZEN'S INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

The *Introduction to the Old Testament* which Professor Aage Bentzen published in English translation in two volumes in 1948–49 has now been republished in a single volume, together with an Appendix of thirty closely printed pages (Oxford University Press; 80s. net). The previously issued work has been photographically reproduced, and that meant that only minor changes could be introduced into the text. In the Appendix, however, Professor Bentzen shows full acquaintance with more recent publications, and keeps his reader abreast of the latest work. At several points he discusses the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls on various questions, and there are some valuable pages on the problem of the Suffering Servant, where, *inter alia*, he takes the present reviewer to task for his rejection of the autobiographical theory.

The features of this work which give it special value for English readers are the space given to the question of the Canon and of literary forms in the Old Testament, and the constant mediation of the work of Scandinavian scholars, so much of which is elsewhere accessible only in the Scandinavian languages. As every one knows, in recent years Scandinavian Old Testament scholarship has been particularly active, and its work has been much discussed. While the arguments cannot be presented and examined with any fullness in a work on this scale, dealing with the whole of the Old Testament, the reader is enabled to know what the Scandinavian views on a great number of issues are. This second edition is evidence that the work has been found useful, and it may be commended to new readers in its new form.

H. H. ROWLEY

A MASTER OF OECUMENICS

One feature of Christianity in the past half-century has been the growth and ramification of world-wide organization aiming at expressing the Church's essential unity and integrating and stimulating its missionary effort. In all these international and interdenominational enterprises one towering personality was active. The modern feeling in the Church for its world-mission and the call to overleap all national and racial barriers is very largely due to the genius and toil and driving force of John R. Mott. It is altogether fitting that a year after his death Dr. Galen M. Fisher should offer in *John R. Mott, Architect of Co-operation and Unity* (Association Press, New York; $3.50) a careful account of the contacts, journeys, and contributions he made in the course of his long and devoted life.

This book is no biography, rather a chronicle of events and undertakings than a personal narrative. But it does note the curiously early and definite global range of Mott's interest and vision, his genius for skilful collaboration and chairmanship, his deep and dominating spiritual fervour and personal piety, the influence he exercised on people in high position, his uncanny power of extracting enormous donations from wealthy men. And the book incorporates tributes of profound admiration from many outstanding men. It also indicates with quotations certain lines of criticism, particularly of the largeness of the personal initiative and control that he could exercise through the enormous funds placed at his disposal; and of the immaturity of his theological interest and a lack of deep insight into social and political forces.

The opinion cited from Dr. Cavert that 'next to the Apostle Paul the Christian Church owes more to Mott than to any other one of its missionary leaders' is probably true. The World Student Christian Federation, The World Service of the Y.M.C.A., The Student Volunteer Movement, The World Missionary Conference, The Faith and Order Movement, The World Council of Churches are mentioned here with other organizations which have involved intricate systems of committees, elaborate files of correspondence, enormous conventions of delegates, vast expense. No Church historian of our times could omit from his view this material. He may even speculate how far in this way the pattern is emerging of the true unity that exists and that will be expressed when a World Christianity and a World Church become the same thing.

R. W. STEWART

ḲIMḤI'S HEBREW GRAMMAR

Nearly twenty years ago Dr. William Chomsky published the first part of a work on the Hebrew

Grammar of the mediæval Jew, David Ḳimḥi. This work has now been completed and issued in a single volume, in response to the initiative and generosity of a number of Dr. Chomsky's friends —*David Ḳimḥi's Hebrew Grammar* (*Mikhlol*) : Systematically Presented and Critically Annotated (Bloch Publishing Co., New York ; $7.50). The work of Ḳimḥi is given in translation, but instead of being set out in Ḳimḥi's order, which was unsystematic and repetitious, the material has been systematically arranged, so that though it is all included in the present volume the work is shorter and more easily usable by modern students. In addition a vast amount of very scholarly work has been done by Dr. Chomsky and embodied in the voluminous notes added to the translation. The systematic study of Hebrew Grammar did not begin with Ḳimḥi, but with other Jewish scholars in Spain, but Ḳimḥi's work mediated to Jews in other parts of Europe the fruits of that study and also brought its own contribution. Indeed the saying from the Mishnah, 'If there is no meal (*ḳemaḥ*) there is no study of the Torah,' was adapted to give the *mot*, 'Were there no *Ḳimḥi*, there would be no study of the Torah.' The first to perceive the triliteral character of the Hebrew verb was Dunash ben Lavrat. The mediæval Jew ibn Janaḥ already perceived that in certain forms in the Old Testament we have preserved a passive of Ḳal. Modern scholars now recognize this, but for long it was not recognized by Western scholars. Dr. Chomsky traces the origins of these and a great many other grammatical ideas, and shows in his notes where Ḳimḥi stood in the controversies of his own time, and his researches are of the highest value to modern students of Hebrew Grammar. The notes are also valuable because of their abundant references to the work of modern authorities in this field, while the whole book is excellently indexed and made accessible to the student. H. H. Rowley

How comes it that since the time of Harnack successive attempts to recover the essence of Christianity emphasize general truths shared by other religions and not distinctive of it, except in degree ? This question is provoked by Professor William E. Wilson's *Essential Christianity* (Allen and Unwin ; 12s. 6d. net). Professor Wilson, formerly of Woodbrooke and Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, stands in the genial succession of those who advocate a 'reduced Christianity.' Creeds, sacraments, and the like are objects of suspicion as excrescences which have perverted and concealed the simplicity of the faith, which consists of God's love appealing to men's 'insight' and calling for repentance, that is, primarily 'a change of mind.' 'I suggest,' he says, 'that the right approach to the true meaning of "belief" is to assume that it means belief that Jesus was right and must be followed. He utterly depended on God ; so must we.' It is all as simple as that ! The Cross is the demonstration that the love of God is without limit, and 'the one purpose of all Gospel preaching ought to be to get men to use their insight to see Jesus, see that He was right, that God is love, that men may trust Him utterly, and therefore commit their lives to Him.' It seems a great pity that the Church has failed to lay aside every weight, encumbering itself with beliefs like the Second Advent and Anselmic interpretations of the Atonement, and failing to rejoice in the comfort of universalism ! Or has it penetrated more deeply to what 'essential Christianity' really is ?

The S.P.C.K. and the Cambridge University Press have published the text of the Service to be used for the Queen's Coronation—*The Coronation Service of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II* (8s. 6d. net)—together with a short history of the rite. The history has been written by the eminent liturgical scholar, Professor Edward C. Ratcliff. The volume includes also changes introduced since the Coronation of King George VI and is most attractively printed in red and black and bound in red buckram.

At various prices also (the paper-covered edition is 1s. 6d. net) the Cambridge University Press have issued the Form and Order of the Abbey Service without commentary.

Several editions of the Coronation Service have also been published by the Oxford University Press. The popular edition (paper covers) is 1s. 6d. ; the standard edition (stout paper covers) 5s. ; another (red buckram boards) 8s. 6d. ; and a de luxe (red or blue leather) 25s.

Listeners and viewers should find these editions of the printed Service a great help, and many will wish to keep them as souvenirs.

The Art of Dodging Repentance, by the Rev. D. R. Davies (Canterbury Press ; 10s. 6d. net), is a volume of sermons which at one time repels by its faults and at another fascinates by its virtues. In his own Foreword Mr. Davies, with a certain complacence, claims that he never preaches down to his congregation. 'Spurgeon used to remind his students that our Lord's injunction was "feed my sheep," not "feed my giraffes." But I have had no compunction in subjecting the sheep to a little neck-stretching.' But when one has read the sermons one concludes that very little neck-stretching would be necessary. Mr. Davies has most certainly a gift of wit and of pungent phrase

but there are times when, as Dr. Johnson said, 'the merriment of parsons is mighty offensive.' 'The medieval crusades were a godsend to many a henpecked husband, and to many a spendthrift whose debts had become unpayable. They were a way of escape from a difficult personal relationship. How many a pilgrim father, I wonder, braved the dangerous wastes of the unknown Atlantic to escape the still more dangerous wastes of the only too well-known pilgrim mother?' 'That figure calls for the swallowing capacity of a pelican (I'm referring, of course, to the bird not the Pelican books).' Things like these are not really funny. And yet when one has said all on the debit side that can be said it remains to be said that this is a valuable book. There are unforgettable phrases. 'A caricature of greatness is still preferable to the photograph of a nonentity!' 'The supreme mark of the barbarian is the passion to sacrifice the temporary to the permanent.' 'Somebody once said that the supreme purpose of education was to enable a man to ask the right questions.'

There are two really notable sermons. That entitled 'Dead Souls' is that rare thing, a sermon on conditional immortality. That entitled 'The Meaning of the Fringe' ably expounds the thesis that when the centre degenerates it is often the people and the nations who are out on the fringe who bring in the revitalizing and recreating force which saves the centre which once begat them. This book never deviates from relevance. It talks to men in their own language and uses metaphors which the twentieth century can understand. It may have its defects but it has a message.

On p. 42 Jn 14^{16} should be Jn 3^{16}. On p. 50 the Kierkegaard quotation has no opening quotation marks. On line 18, p. 100 there is an omitted question mark.

It is curious how many people are puzzled by the word 'Ecumenical.' Lately a guileless Christian was heard to speak of the 'Equinoctial Movement.' There is certainly room for a plain statement of the elementary facts, and this is now provided by Professor Norman V. Hope in his booklet, *One Christ, One World, One Church* (Church Historical Society, Philadelphia; $1.00).

The author is a Church of Scotland minister who has for some years been teaching Church History at Princeton. He surveys the rise of missionary concern within Protestantism and the strength through unity that has developed in this sphere since Edinburgh 1910. The story of both 'Faith and Order' and 'Life and Work' leads to an account of Amsterdam 1948. In a concluding chapter some difficulties and problems of the Movement are fairly stated, and achievements up to the present are assessed. There is a useful list of relevant literature.

Dr. Hope rightly calls for ecumenical education at the local congregational level. Interest is indeed still confined to a very limited circle in most churches, and not least in Scotland where perhaps the relative absence of sectarianism tends to obscure the seriousness of the world issue.

The Life of the Bible, by the late Professor Ernest Sutherland Bates, was first published in America in 1936. It is now published in this country, revised and introduced by Mr. Charles Foster Davey (Andre Deutsch; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Bates is best known for his 'The Bible Designed to be Read as Literature,' and was Professor of English Literature in the Universities of Arizona and Oregon. The title of the book is perhaps unfortunate. It would seem to suggest a book on the background of the Bible and this book is in fact a history of the Bible. It gathers a vast amount of material into its one hundred and sixty pages; and its great value is that it does give a synoptic view of the whole. There are sections on Mediaevalism, on Translations, and on the Crusades which are of fascinating interest. Dr. Bates could write. Again and again there comes the flashing phrase. Josiah was 'the idealistic youth'; Jeremiah was 'the conscientious objector' and 'the first of many Hamlets'; Isaiah is 'the aristocrat'; Micah is 'the prophet of the poor'; Amos is 'the bugle-call'; Ezekiel is 'the mystic . . . with the apocalyptic style.' The sub-title of the book claims that it is 'a brief account of its (the Bible's) character, authorship, text, translation, and influence on the evolution of mankind.' Its seven chapters are on The General Character of the Bible, The Authors, Conflict over Creed and Canon, The Bible under Mediaevalism, The Great Translations, The Higher Criticism, and The Bible and the Stream of Life. The normal reaction will be that it is impossible to do all this in a hundred and sixty pages. But it is precisely the fact that all this is vividly drawn together in a small compass that gives this book its value.

Dr. David R. Mace, M.A., B.Sc., has written a sociological study of *Hebrew Marriage* (Epworth Press; 21s. net). The author was formerly a Methodist minister who felt more and more drawn to the critical problems of modern marriage, until he became a pioneer in the formation of Marriage Guidance Councils, and now holds a Professorship in the U.S.A. The volume is a semi-popular study of some two hundred and seventy pages. The author states in the Preface that most of his material was gathered before 1942. In any case

a large proportion of his references are to encyclopaedias and general works. According to the blurb, the volume 'fills a serious gap in the existing literature.' This is true, since the book is a popular book. An academic study of the subject published in 1953 should have contained discussions of seven technical studies of the subject published in the last eleven years (two by L. M. Epstein, two by Hilma Granqvist, volumes by E. Neufeld, J. W. Gasper, and G. Parrender). The author maintains that Hebrew marriage was essentially monogamous, and that the status of the Hebrew wife was very high indeed within her own home. Within its limits the book is helpful and interesting, but the reader is warned that there are serious gaps.

It is an odd but true fact that no cause has been worse served by its literature than the cause of Temperance. Most Temperance publications are well calculated to do more harm than good to the cause they aim to support. That criticism cannot be made of *Why Not Have a Drink—If You're a Christian*, by Mr. John Murray (Independent Press; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Murray was brought up in a home and in circumstances where moderate indulgence in alcoholic liquor was the recognized thing. He tells us that when he entered the life of a Free Church and became a practising Christian he became a convert to the cause of total abstinence. This book is written with entire sincerity but with a lightness of touch which makes it excellent reading. The first chapter states the problem. Mr. Murray insists that the Christian 'must face the issue (of total abstinence) with as much care and prayer as he would give to other problems of Christian conduct, such as whether or not he should gamble, whether he ought to be a pacifist, whether or not he ought in any circumstances to enter into sexual intimacy outside marriage.' The second chapter deals with statistics. In 1948 the colossal sum of £762,000,000 was spent in this country on alcoholic liquor. In 1938–39 the profits of the brewers were £27,000,000, and in 1946–47 they were £49,000,000. The third chapter points out the uneconomic use of labour and food and the inroads on income that indulgence in alcoholic liquor causes. The fourth chapter deals with the Christian's responsibility to God and his neighbour. The remaining chapters deal with the stock defences of drinking, the opinions of well-known figures regarding it and the steps which the Church can take to counteract it. The book's value is enhanced by the amusing and effective drawings of Mr. P. Gwyn Filby.

The Rev. Edward Charles Rich, Canon-Emeritus of Peterborough, writes on *Spiritual Authority in the Church of England* (Longmans; 21s. net). In a Preface he tells how the subject has occupied his mind for many years, and how the book that he has written differs greatly from what at first he pictured it would be, and that he hopes to write more fully later on. One may hazard a guess that one main factor in causing him to question his earlier thought has been the Ecumenical Movement. In that Movement he is persuaded that the Anglican Church is called to play a great part.

His question is, what *is* the spiritual authority recognized in the Church of England? and he concludes that it is Holy Scripture, and the doctrinal decisions of the undivided Church, with place left for the revelation of new aspects or emphases on this or that detail as the Holy Spirit may lead.

It is a scholarly, well-written book in which the fruits of extensive study and thought are manifest. Some things are left rather obscure, as when in the closing passage one is left wondering if the writer is advocating some kind of Pope as final arbiter of the validity of new light.

The first edition of Principal Vincent Taylor's *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (50s. net)—reviewed by Professor A. M. Hunter in the July 1952 issue—sold out in six months. Those who have not yet procured a copy will be glad to know that the publishers—Messrs. Macmillan—have now brought out a second edition.

The Acts of the Apostles, by the Rev. H. A. Guy, B.D., B.A. (Macmillan; 6s. net), is the kind of book for which Mr. Guy is becoming deservedly widely known. It is a simple commentary designed in general for any layman who wishes to make an intelligent study of Acts and in particular for candidates for examinations such as the General Certificate of Education on the 'Ordinary' level. It will fulfil that purpose admirably. It has very naturally the defects of its qualities; for instance, the place of the Mystery Religions in Hellenistic religious life is dismissed in ten and a half lines. But the fact remains that it is dismissed in such a way as to make any intelligent reader desire to know more about it. The introduction is excellent, with a full knowledge of all the up-to-date available material. It is not a detailed commentary. It divides Acts into twenty-eight sections, each with an appropriate title; at the head of the section it gives a brief but adequate summary; and then there follows an explanation of the passage. This is not an ambitious book nor is it a book for the specialist. It was not meant to be, but it supplies a need and supplies it well. We only hope that Mr. Guy will go on producing such volumes as this.

International Company Orders and Bible Class Notes for Young People, 1953, issued by the Salvation Army and published by authority of the General from International Headquarters at the price of 3s. 3d. net, is a Bible Class Handbook of which any religious body might well be proud. It contains one whole year's studies. There are seven sections—Days from Peter's Diary, Honoured Women of Ancient Days, The March of Spirit-filled Men, which consists of studies in Acts, Founders of the Hebrew Race, Lieutenants of the Early Church, Dreams that Came True, and Songs at the Saviour's Birth. There is a quite unusual freshness about the whole book. It is packed with illustrations which are new and unhackneyed. Many of them come from the history of the Salvation Army. It is relevant to state that in all matters of technical scholarship the book is thoroughly up-to-date. This is a most excellent Handbook, and we wish it a circulation far beyond the bounds of the Salvation Army.

The Rev. Reginald Haw, D.S.C., M.A., B.C.L., Vicar of Humberstone, Lincolnshire, has given us a very learned and interesting book—*The State of Matrimony* (S.P.C.K.; 21s. net). The sub-title explains the contents—'An Investigation of the Relationship between Ecclesiastical and Civil Marriage in England after the Reformation, with a Consideration of the Laws relating thereto.' The work is an exposition and defence of what the Church of England has consistently taught all along, and a plea that she is challenged by modern practice to re-affirm and resolutely stand true to her historical principles as to the indissolubility of Christian marriage save by death, with the consequent refusal to marry in the Church any divorced person whose spouse is still alive. State and Church have fallen apart on this question. In the Law Courts a staggering number of marriages are 'dissolved' year by year. The root-cause is that the legal and the Church view of marriage differ. According to the former, marriage is just a contract; to the latter, marriage is not a contract but a status in which the parties voluntarily bind themselves together for life by a mystical, sacramental bond which is indissoluble, not in the sense that it ought not to be broken, but in the literal sense that it cannot be broken.

While the book is addressed to Anglicans, it will, in its practical suggestions as to what might be done in the divorce-situation, make a much wider appeal. Means must be found to ensure that couples applying for a church wedding shall be instructed in what the Christian view of marriage is; and the churches must work in close co-operation with Marriage Guidance organizations.

The S.C.M. Press continues its good and helpful work in publishing its 'Studies in Biblical Theology' series. *Studies in Deuteronomy*, No. 9 in the series (7s. net), is the latest volume to hand. It is a translation of Professor Gerhard von Rad's *Deuteronomium-Studien* from the revised edition of 1948. A review by Professor H. H. Rowley of the original [1947] work was published in The Expository Times, lx. 54f. [November 1948]. Professor von Rad shows that the so-called Deuteronomic Code is really in the form of an address by Moses, with ancient laws interspersed with homiletical, exhortatory material. In this respect it is similar to the Holiness Code, except that the Holiness Code is in the form of Divine speeches, some to the people, and some to the priests. The third chapter shows the connexion of the idea of the Name of God with Deuteronomy as against that of the Glory and the Meeting with the Priestly Code, and allocates the one to Shechem originally and the other to Hebron. The study of the idea of the Holy War, the marked and distinctive characteristic of the Book, leads to a reaffirmation of a seventh century origin. The concluding chapters deal with the Provenance of Deuteronomy, its Purpose, and the working out of its theology in the Books of Kings. The monograph is of great importance for the study of Deuteronomy, and all interested in Old Testament studies cannot fail to be glad that it is made easily accessible to English readers.

Dr. Floyd V. Filson, Professor of New Testament Literature and History in the McCormick Theological Seminary, U.S.A., has written an excellent popular account of the message and significance of the New Testament writings in *Opening the New Testament* (Westminster Press, Philadelphia; $2.50), a book which will interest the student as well as the general reader. Beginning with the story behind the writings, he has treated the books in succession, showing how they reflect the spoken word of the early preachers and the experiences of the first Christians. To each chapter reading hints are appended and passages for special study are noted. On the critical side the results reached are conservative, perhaps more so than is common in Great Britain to-day. The Imprisonment Epistles are associated with Rome, the 'circular' hypothesis concerning Ephesians is accepted, and no decided opinion regarding the Pastoral Epistles is expressed. But the strength of the book does not lie on the critical side, but in its treatment of the contents and especially the religious value of the Gospels and Epistles. Written with restrained passion in a very attractive style, this book will fulfil a valuable purpose wherever the New Testament writings are prized.

Christian Belief in a Scientific Age

By Professor William Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., Butler University, Indianapolis

In *The Truth of the Gospel*,[1] written by Professor G. B. Caird of McGill University, Montreal, the question of 'Science—friend or foe?' is discussed. Professor Caird begins by saying, 'Any one who tells you to-day that there is a dispute between science and religion is behind the times. There have been disputes in the past, and the effect of some of them doubtless lingers in the minds of those who are thinking to-day what others were thinking thirty years ago. But religious doctrines and scientific theories alike are constantly being revised, and among the leaders of scientific and Christian thought there is not now any major cause for disagreement.'

In a way, this statement is true, and yet many people will have lingering qualifications they wish to make. They will be remembering the recent broadcast talks of Professor Hoyle of Cambridge,[2] and perhaps, in another field, Barbara Wootton and her recent *Testament for Social Science*. Caird's statement is, I think, more true of the physical sciences—in spite of Professor Hoyle—than it is of the human or social sciences, represented by Barbara Wootton. For a physicist, for example, who accepts the main principles of Einstein's theory of relativity and of Planck's quantum physics, and who understands what the Christian Faith contains, there can be no serious quarrel between the two. The battle has moved from this ground on to the field occupied by the human or social sciences, such as history, psychology, sociology, economics, and political theory.

To see this matter in proper perspective we need to have a rough historical picture. The quarrel between science and religion is a very old one. It began in the first age of scientific advance in pre-Socratic Greek philosophy. There were two attitudes towards the religious or spiritual interpretation of the universe and of life. One of these tended ultimately towards complete scepticism—not only scepticism of a spiritual interpretation, but scepticism in the field of knowledge altogether. At the end of this scientific age appear Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, none of whom shares the scepticism, and all of whom give a spiritual interpretation of the universe and of life and provide the basis for philosophical thinking for the next two thousand years. But the sceptical scientific attitude was not destroyed. It lived on, especially amongst the Epicurean philosophers and receives what may well be its finest expression ever in the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius (98–55 B.C.). Lucretius was a poet, scientist, and philosopher and this poem is noteworthy because it forecasts many scientific discoveries which did not come to light for over another thousand years. It is, no doubt, the most telling and most beautifully written creed of the Naturalist ever to be framed.

It is difficult for us to realize—living, as we do, in an age which takes progress for granted—that for over a thousand years from the time of Lucretius there was no scientific advance whatever. In the fifteenth century, for example, the same principles of medicine and surgery were being applied as in the days of our Lord. In the same century people still accepted the same astronomical view of the universe as was held by the ancient Greeks, that of a three-storied world, the world a flat disc, an over-world of Elysium and an under-world of Hades, the world the centre of the universe, and the sun, moon, and planets travelling round it in fixed orbits. In the field of mathematics there had been little advance on that of the Babylonians which the Greeks had inherited. In the field of chemistry there was still held the firm belief of the Greek atomists that all things were made of four elements—earth, water, air, and fire, together with an etherial substance called phlogiston, very similar to the nineteenth-century ether. Along with all this went belief in astrology and alchemy, the latter mainly engaged in three pursuits—that of discovering the 'philosophers' stone' which would turn base metals into gold; that of discovering the 'elixir of life,' which would endow man with immortality; and that of discovering 'perpetual motion.' Not until the stirrings of the Renaissance was there any advance at all in the field of scientific knowledge.

Even then, the advance in its repercussions on Christian belief is not seriously felt until the seventeenth century when the modern world, which is marked by a new period in scientific advance, comes into being. The trouble began a little earlier when Galileo astonished the world by announcing that the earth was not the centre of the universe, but a planet circling round the sun. The idea, entirely new in scientific as well as religious fields, conflicted with the description of

[1] The third volume of *A Primer of Christianity* [Oxford University Press].

[2] Given in the B.B.C. 'Third Programme' and now published by the Cambridge Press.

the world found in the Bible, and theologians of the day considered that it detracted from the dignity of man, whom they believed God had made as the crown of His creation. The Church of Rome compelled Galileo to recant and the newly formed Protestant churches were in agreement with Rome. I imagine that there is no reader of this article for whom that controversy is alive to-day, but for Roman Catholics it was forbidden to believe in the Copernican Universe till the early years of the nineteenth century, and we must not forget that there are still minor Christian sects who make belief in a flat earth and the earth as the centre of the universe a major tenet of their systems.[1]

Since that time the theologians have made other attempts to interfere with the free course of scientific inquiry. Such an attempt was made in the early years of the nineteenth century when the geologists, investigating fossil remains, began to speculate on the age of the earth's crust and to put it in the region of scores of thousands of years. This to many was shocking, for did not the Bible put the creation at 4004 B.C. ? Indeed, such a date appeared at the beginning of the first chapter of Genesis in most Bibles of those days, though it had no business there at all. One recalls the somewhat amusing but pathetic attempt of the father of Edmund Gosse, who was a devout Plymouth Brother though a Fellow of the Royal Society of London. He wrote a book in which he claimed that God had put the fossils there purposely to confound the geologists ! [2] You smile at this, but remember that the elder Gosse was a man of scientific temper, distinguished by the highest scientific honour known. It only shows to what lengths people will go in order to defend supposed necessities of Christian belief.

But the best known of these conflicts is the furore raised by Darwin's theory of evolution, popularized by Herbert Spencer in the form that man was descended (or ascended !) from the anthropoid ape. The old lady in a Mayfair drawing-room said, ' If it is true, it is not a thing to mention in polite society ! ' What, however, is not generally known is that the fiercest opposition and most bitter attack came, not from the churches, but from his fellow-scientist, Richard Owen (1804–1892), perhaps the greatest anatomist ever, and from that wayward writer Samuel Butler whose ideas Bernard Shaw embodied in his *Back to Methuselah*. What also is not remembered is that few churchmen joined in the fray led by Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, and that the churchmen who opposed Darwin were also opposed to the new critical approach to the Bible, which has since achieved almost universal recognition. As Caird says, ' The real battle was not between Science and Religion, but between the scientific and religious die-hards on the one hand and the progressive thinkers in both fields, on the other.' The Church of Rome still defends its mediæval fortress of belief and places most scientific books on the Index of forbidden books ; and amongst smaller Protestant sects the verbal inerrancy of the Scriptures is still held, placing them in conflict with science. We still remember William Jennings Bryan and the furore in the State Schools of Tennessee. But the real leaders of Protestant thought regard science as an ally—not as an enemy, but as an ally in the fight against superstition.

Neither does the blame for past disputes lie wholly with Christians. Many scientists have made, and still do make, unjustifiable claims for science. They have claimed (as Barbara Wootton does to-day) that the scientific method is the only trustworthy path to truth, and what science does not know, is not knowledge. If such a claim were true, the foundations of religious belief would be undermined. But let us remember : (1) that we do not commonly find this attitude to religion taken by scientists of the first rank, for all *great* scientists are humble men well aware of their limitations and their minds ever open to *new* truth ; (2) there has always been a good number of *Christian* men of science, men who have regarded the laws of Nature as the laws of God. You cannot dismiss religion in the name of science without convicting them of hypocrisy. If science and religion were really incompatible, all scientists would be atheists, and this is very far from being the case. The thing which divides Christian and non-Christian scientists can hardly be the one thing they have in common —their scientific training ; (3) the most important reason for the harmony between science and religion is that in the past thirty years or so a great change has come over the world of science. Scientists who are abreast of their times no longer speak with a dogmatic certainty, for many of the theories about which they once spoke with confidence have been, either swept away, or seriously modified. This applies even to Newton's three Laws of Motion. They do not now speak of ether, that tenuous substance once supposed to pervade all space. They hesitate to speak even of matter. There is hardly one of their technical terms which does not require a new definition. An almost apologetic note has crept into their utterances. This may be only a temporary failure of nerve in the face of a startling array of new facts, but it is a welcome change from nineteenth-century cocksureness ; and, above all, it serves to show that

[1] In Rutlandshire, almost the centre of England, a small sea-girt land, there is a sect of ' Flat-earth Baptists ' who are equipped with clever maps of the world to show the truth of their position !

[2] See *Father and Son*, by Edmund Gosse.

what to-day may be accepted as a law of Nature is but a provisional hypothesis which may be superseded to-morrow.

This, as I see it, is the situation in the field where first-class scientists and theologians meet. But changes of this kind take a long time to seep through to the general public, and the idea is still current that there is a dispute between science and Christianity, or, to put it more clearly, between the scientific and Christian interpretations of the universe. I will, therefore, try to say something about it.

In the first place we must be clear what we mean by the *Christian* interpretation of the universe. This interpretation is based upon the revelation or *disclosure* of God given in the Bible. Whilst the Bible itself makes the claim that this knowledge of God is *given*, and does not come to man solely by the scientific method of the search for truth (and as we have seen and will further discuss, there are other methods of arriving at truth); it makes no claim to be a book of scientific knowledge or of conveying truth in general in the field of every subject under the sun. It is a book about God and about man, and the relationship between God and man which God seeks to establish. Nor does the Bible, itself, make any claim to verbal inerrancy. Moreover, it does not set out to provide us with *metaphysical* knowledge about God in Himself. Throughout, on this question, there is a definite agnosticism. In this it is unlike most other sacred books. It is much more concerned with the *character* of God, with God's ways with men. It reveals, quite frankly, a *personal* God, righteous and loving, who enters into relationship with man in order to reconcile him to Himself and to his fellow-man. God is the Ultimate One, who is the Creator of all that there is, of the universe which we see and which is capable of scientific investigation; of time and space in which the universe exists; and of the spiritual world by which it is upheld. But He is also the Intimate One, who enters into relationship with the world He has created, and especially with man, in order to redeem the world and man from the futility and frustration into which both have fallen through sin and evil. The view of God here presented is frankly that of a *personal* and *ethical* God differing considerably from pantheistic and deistic notions of the Absolute. Such a God as is here presented reveals Himself *in history* by His *acted* and spoken Word. The Bible, in a very real sense, is about 'the mighty acts of God.' These acts, being in history, are necessarily confined to time and space. Hence the Covenant idea, beginning with the Covenant with Noah and narrowing down to that with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, until at last the 'Word becomes flesh' in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth, in whom God is seen as *incarnate* and as *intemporate*. Christian belief is centred, therefore, in what God has done in Jesus Christ, His birth, life, death, resurrection, and exaltation and in the continuation of that work in the coming of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church.

It will at once be seen that this corpus of belief is scarcely touched at all by the *physical* sciences. The defence of Christian belief against the claims of the physical sciences does not consist of harmonizing ancient stories about six days of a static creation, nor about whales swallowing men, nor suns standing still (all of which may be found in poetic or allegorical narrative or couched in myth), with the demands of any one physical science. The attack and defence are wide of the mark. The real attack comes from the assertion of a Naturalist position, either in the form of materialism, or energism, or logical positivism, or humanism, that there is really nothing in the universe to explain —it explains itself if the scientific method is pursued. So rapid and successful has the advance of the physical sciences been during the past two centuries that the result is indeed impressive. As Dr. Fosdick says, 'Comparatively few people are appealing to God: almost everybody is appealing to the health commissioner. Not many people are relying upon religion; everybody is relying upon science. As one faces the pregnant significance of that contrast, one sees that in important sections of our modern life science has come to occupy the place that God used to have in the reliance of our forefathers. For the dominant fact of our generation is power over the world which has been put into our hands through the knowledge of laws, and the consequence is that the scientific mastery of life seems man's indispensible and sufficient resource. . . . Why should we trust God, or concern ourselves with the deep secrets of religious faith, if all we need to do is met by learning laws, blowing upon our hands, and going to work?'[1] This is the virus which has eaten deeply at the vitals of modern scientific man.

I must, therefore, give some attention to the scientific method, making clear what it really is. In the first place, we must note the highly specialized nature of modern research. Any one who is to make his mark in science to-day must specialize in a narrow field of investigation. He will concentrate on that field to the neglect of all other areas of study. Darwin once confessed to a friend that, in order to give himself wholly to biological study, he had to sacrifice many interests, so that finally he lost his appreciation of art, music, and religion. Powers which are not in constant use soon begin to atrophy. A scientist, then, should be listened to with respect whilst he speaks on his

[1] *Christianity and Progress*, 52 f.

own special subject, but when he makes excursions into other fields he goes as an amateur. A man who speaks with authority as a physicist may be a faltering guide to modern developments in biochemistry, a poor historian, and a bad theologian. You might think that his scientific training would stand him in good stead whatever subject he approached, but in practice scientists are quite capable of leaving their training in the laboratory and becoming ordinary gullible mortals in their spare time. Professor Hoyle, when he stepped out of his own field into that of Biblical interpretation, is a typical example.

Secondly, we must remember that every science proceeds by means of abstraction, *i.e.*, it does not deal with an object *as a whole*, but only with those characteristics of it with which it is concerned. All irrelevant facts are deliberately excluded. Mathematics deals with things in so far as they can be numbered and measured. Physics deals with things in so far as they are capable of motion; chemistry in so far as they can be analysed into their constituent elements; biology in so far as they have life and growth. Each science deals only with one facet of the diamond of truth. This method of science justifies itself by its results when applied to natural phenomena. But when we wish to study, for example, a painting by Constable or a work of Beethoven, the scientific approach deliberately ignores all that is significant. The physicist may know a great deal about vibrations, but he cannot give you a formula for the composition of a symphony. The chemist may analyse the paints on a canvas, but only an artist can produce a masterpiece in painting. Similarly, the scientist deliberately excludes from his consideration all evidence on which religious belief is founded. Any argument against religion, therefore, based on natural science is about as sound as the argument of Lord Nelson when he put the telescope to his blind eye and said that he could not see the signal. Unfortunately, with masses of people, the argument is just as effective. The methodology of cause and effect, so rigidly applied in the field of science (until most recent times), is most properly so applied, but it is quite false to assume that the methodology is more than a method to be applied in a limited field, that it is a metaphysical explanation of all that exists.

Thirdly, we must beware of allowing an exaggerated reverence for natural science to lead us into a real trap—the trap of false analogy.[1] By this I mean the attempt to apply a set of rules drawn from one science to another area of knowledge where they do not belong. The most notorious example was the use Herbert Spencer made of Darwin's theory of natural selection. In trying to explain the origin of biological species, Darwin formed the theory that when variations take place within any genus of *living* things, those variations would survive if they equipped the creature better in the struggle for existence and would die out if they did not. Spencer took this idea of 'the survival of the fittest' and applied it to human society. He, therefore, produced a justification for un-limited self-seeking, cut-throat economics, and political tyranny, some of the results of which we are seeing in the world of our day (quite different from the results which Spencer forecast, which only goes to show the foolishness of this method of analogy). If I mistake not, Barbara Wootton, in her brilliant book, *The Testament of Social Science*, has imbibed deeply at the spring of Spencer, probably more than she has realized, at least so far as her fundamental conclusion is concerned—that the scientific method is the *only* way of arriving at truth. Why should Christian believers allow themselves to be bullied out of their faith in the Divine Person in the name of social sciences which cannot see even the human person steadily or see him whole?

Equally disastrous results have been obtained by treating psychology as though it were a branch of physics, so that human behaviour is governed by the same rules of necessity that govern the behaviour of atoms and molecules. A school of psychology known as Behaviourism was founded on this error and had a longer run of popularity than it deserved. Neither political economy nor psychology should have their rules dictated to them by a foreign science, and theology should be allowed its independence along with the rest.

The conflict being waged to-day is often one between a pseudo-Christianity on the one hand, and pseudo-science on the other, and here some words of L. P. Jack's are to the point: 'Most of the "defences of religion" I am acquainted with . . . claim to address themselves to reason. And so indeed they do, but to reason in a low stage of its development, to the half-born reason of the timid and unemancipated soul, to the unheroic side of human nature, treating us as beings whose ultimate interest is to save our own skins, and making use of the logic, admirable in its own field, which self-interest has worked out for that very purpose and which is incapable of reaching any other conclusion. Instead of raising reason to its full-grown stature of religion, they bring religion down to the level of reason while still at the stage of learning the alphabet of its business. To this class of arguments belong Locke's "proofs" of the existence of God, and Paley's of a Beneficient Designer. These argue as though the search

[1] A typical example, which had tremendous influence in certain circles, was Henry Drummond's *Natural Law n the Spiritual World*.

for God were like the search for a lost key, or for an invisible carpenter. To the same class may be assigned a more modern type of apologia, which accommodates religion to the supposed demands of physical science, or equates the Kingdom of Heaven with social reform, or domesticates the eternal values to the service of temporal utility, or harmonizes God with democracy, or with whatever else may be the popular obsession of the moment—all of them based on the principle of making concessions to the unconverted reason of carnal men, thereby sacrificing the higher logic of the spirit to the lower logic of the senses.' [1]

There are a good many beliefs to-day masquerading as science, when in fact they are philosophies of life, and, therefore, rivals of Christianity. The commonest of them is called materialism, naturalism, or determinism. It is the belief that the physical universe or Nature is the only reality, and that it is a closed system of cause and effect, so that every event follows inevitably from what went before—the ancient view that 'there is nothing new under the sun.' [2] There is nothing particularly *scientific* about this view of the world, for it can be neither proved nor disproved by *scientific* means. It has been confused with science simply because the scientist, owing to the nature of his task, concentrates attention on the physical and by-passes the spiritual. But materialism has an important corollary which makes it untenable by an *intelligent* person and fatal to the pursuit of natural science. If we suppose materialism to be true, it follows that we are unable to trust the processes of the human mind; for, if my thoughts are wholly determined by the arrangements of the atoms of my brain, assisted perhaps by my spinal cord, I have no reason to suppose that these thoughts are true. If my thoughts and yours differ on any subject, it is ridiculous to say that one of us is *right* and the other *wrong*. You might as well say that a rose is true and a lily false. Both our thoughts occur, both are natural phenomena, and what we mistakenly call falsehood is as natural as what we call truth. But in that case, we have no reason to suppose that *materialism* is true. In fact materialism presents us with the famous dilemma, 'All arguments are false, including this one.' The materialist has entirely failed to explain how a mind capable of rational thought could have evolved from a physical universe controlled by non-rational forces. The effect is out of all proportion to the cause.[3] His great mistake is to treat *everything*, including mind, as the object of scientific research, and as that only. But in all research there is *subject* as well as *object*, there is the mind of the investigator. Man is not only a specimen to be examined under the microscope in the laboratory: he is the scientist investigating.

Further, materialism also abolishes the distinction between good and evil. If all actions are ultimately determined by antecedent causes, then those we call 'good' and those we call 'bad' are equally inevitable and natural. You may say one action pleases and the other annoys, but it is absurd to say one is *right* and the other *wrong*, for a *material* universe provides you with no standard of conduct or of judgment. But we are continually making moral judgments and mean by them something more than pleasure and annoyance. If the materialist replies, 'Good actions are those by which a creature adapts itself to environment, and bad actions are failure to adapt,' then he admits that our environment has a *moral* quality, a fact which his materialism denies. (By the way, this is very much the ground of the Communist ethics of situation.) At these two points the attempt to explain spiritual things in terms of matter breaks down.

I am not so sure that Bertrand Russell, the greatest and most brilliant exponent of materialism in our day, has not, in his old age, felt its insecurity in a world such as ours. In delivering his lectures on *The Impact of Science on Society*, in Columbia University, New York, in the Fall of 1950, in his opening lecture he warned his hearers that 'the philosophy which is being suggested by the triumphs of science, . . . if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result.' [4] Of course, he delivered many of his customary jibes at religion, and especially the Christian religion, but rarely does he appear to know what he is talking about when he touches this subject. He closed his lectures with the warning that science could offer man greater well-being, but only if three conditions were fulfilled: (1) the abolition of war; (2) the even distribution of power; (3) the limitation of population. But how were these to be attained? It was here that he startled his audience by saying, 'The root of the matter is a very simple and old-fashioned thing, a thing so simple that I am almost afraid to mention it, for fear of the derisive smile with which wise cynics will greet my words. The thing I mean—please forgive me for mentioning it—is love, Christian love, or compassion. If you feel this, you have a motive for existence, a guide in action, a reason for courage, an imperative necessity for intellectual honesty. If you feel this you have all that anybody should need in the way

[1] *Religious Perplexities*, 20 f.

[2] Ec 1[9].

[3] See Balfour, *Theism and Thought*, 187–199; *Theism and Humanism*, 74.

[4] P. 4.

of religion. Although you may not find happiness, you will never know the deep despair of those whose life is aimless and void of purpose, for there is always something that you can do to diminish the awful sum of human misery.' [1] That is at least a long way from materialism which the sciences, both physical and social, are often supposed to demand from intelligent beings, and ought to warn us against being intimidated when we hear its voice, especially when it is uttered in the name of intelligent reason.

[1] P. 59 f.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

You Find What You're Looking For

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., B.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also.' —Mt 6^{21} (R.V.).

One of my friends is a botanist. He knows more about plants and flowers and fiddling little growing things than any one else I have ever met. Once when we were colleagues we went for a cycle ride together in North Wales. You see, I am very fond of mountains and I knew a place where on a clear day we could get a view of the whole Snowdon Range. It meant cycling fifteen miles or so and climbing quite a bit, but I knew that the view from the top would be worth it all. We set off in great style and you can guess that I forced the pace as fast as I could, because I knew how grand it would be when we reached the vantage point.

But it turned out to be a miserable day for me. We hadn't gone half a mile before I missed my friend Bill. I looked back, and all I could see was his bike leaning against a hedge. I went back and found him crawling in a ditch at the roadside. His home was in Ceylon, and he looked up at me with a broad, brown grin and held up a tiny piece of green stuff. 'Look at this,' he exclaimed, 'just look at this.' And he gave it a long Latin name. 'I have never seen a specimen of this since I landed in England.' 'Oh, come on,' I said, 'come to the mountains. You can look at that stuff some other time.'

We mounted again, but in another minute or two I had lost him. I found him enthusing over some silly little moss. So it went on. He had a marvellous time, because he loved plants; and he kept on diving into the hedge bottom and coming out with a few leaves or grasses between his fingers. They didn't interest me at all. In fact, I wondered how ever he could see such tiny things. We never reached the mountains, and I was profoundly disappointed.

In that case, it was just a different kind of interest. Similarly, the contents of a boy's pocket will be described by his supercilious sister as 'a lot of silly rubbish'; but to him those bits and pieces are treasures. Why, he swopped a dozen marbles for that penknife with the broken blade; he really wanted it! On the other hand, he will be pretty sniffy about the fuss she makes of a doll in a pram. It's only a toy; it's no use to any one.

But there are times when it matters very much what things we regard as treasures.

The story goes that there was once a countryman walking with a friend in a New York street. Though the street-cars were whizzing by in all directions, the countryman stopped and said, 'Hark, there's a grasshopper.' The New Yorker laughed at him. 'You don't mean to tell me that you can hear a grasshopper in all that noise.' But he did mean that, and he found it too. 'You see,' he said, 'I am interested in grasshoppers, and so I hear them. People find what they are looking for, more often than not.' And he said that he would put his theory to the test. He took a coin from his pocket and quietly dropped it on the pavement so that it tinkled. Half a dozen people turned round. 'There you are,' he said. 'You people are interested only in making money. That's why you heard that coin.'

The trouble is, as Jesus knew so well, that people who treasure the wrong things grow into the wrong sort of people. People who hoard money become miserable and mean. People whose treasure is their ambition become callous and selfish; they must climb to the top of the tree, no matter how many people suffer as they climb. People who are always worrying what others are thinking of them often become not worth thinking about.

No one ever expressed that truth so neatly as Jesus did in the words of our text, for the converse is also true. If we value truth-telling, we shall become truthful. If we respect bravery, we shall become brave. If we honour the good things, they

will be found in us. If we love Jesus, we shall become like Him—and that is the greatest treasure of all.

The Dividing Wall

By the Reverend A. Whigham Price, M.A., Gateshead

'He is our bond of peace; He has made the two nations one, breaking down the wall that was a barrier between us, the enmity there was between us.'—Eph 2^{14} (Knox).

Once I was on a walking holiday in Germany, hiking down the river Rhine with a friend; the odd thing about the Rhine is that there is an old castle on almost every hill—every time you look up, you seem to see a fresh one. One day, we noticed that on one hill there were two castles instead of the usual one, and they were very close together. Stranger still, midway between them was a high stone wall, which had broken down with the passing of time. We asked if there was a story behind all this, and sure enough there was. It appeared that long, long ago, two brothers had lived together in one castle, but one day they had a bitter quarrel and one of them went off to the other end of the castle grounds and built himself another castle, and when it was finished he had a high wall built to separate his garden from his brother's. And they lived the rest of their lives like that, with a high barrier between them.

That seemed to me a sort of picture of what is happening all the time in the world; people who are really brothers, because they have the same Father, quarrel, and build a kind of invisible wall between each other. They retreat into their own castle of pride and glare angrily at each other—the British and the Russians, white men and black men, employers and workmen, even brothers and sisters, sometimes. Perhaps it sometimes happens in your own home, when you and your brother or sister have a quarrel over some game; for a time you play happily and, then, suddenly it all ends in anger and tears and bitter words.

But that scene reminded me of something else—something St. Paul said in his letter to the Christians at Ephesus. 'He [that is, Christ] is our bond of peace; He has made the two nations one, *breaking down the wall that was a barrier between us*, the enmity that was between us.' It is almost as though St. Paul had actually seen those two castles on the Rhine, isn't it? Only God can bring together people who have quarrelled as badly as that; and He has created His Church as the place where it is done—the family in which all kinds of people, often belonging to opposing camps which have no love lost between them (like black men and white men, or employers and workers), can realize their brotherhood, and live and work happily together, with all hatred and suspicion done away with, and all past wrongs forgiven. Christ is the great 'reconciler,' the great breaker-down of dividing walls. And because we belong to Him that is always to be one of the marks of our lives also—people who knock down the wall.

The Christian Year [1]

Third Sunday after Trinity

The Lost Coin

By the Reverend Robert Menzies, D.D., Glasgow

'What woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find it?'—Lk 15^{8}.

Jesus did not need to search far for illustrations of the truth He wished to convey.

> The poem hangs on the berry-bush
> When comes the poet's eye,
> The street begins to masquerade
> When Shakespeare passes by.

So it was with Jesus. The most commonplace objects become 'magic casements,' opening out into fathomless vistas of Divine truth.

Consider for a moment the illustration of the lost coin. How homely and familiar its setting! How simple the materials of which it is composed! How human its appeal, and how rich its spiritual suggestiveness! A woman has been searching for a lost coin within her home. It has been suggested that it formed a part of her marriage dowry. A. B. Bruce thinks that it may have been her savings to pay her Temple tax, while others suggest that it was the sum she saved to pay her rent. None of these nor similar suggestions are essential to the sense of the Parable. It may just have been the loss of an ordinary coin, a drachma worth about eightpence in our money. The main point to notice is that the woman was so poor that the loss of this small sum was a major tragedy in her domestic career. There are other hints of her poverty given here. The house had only one room, and such light as there was streamed from the open door. Clearly also the floor was untimbered, for the dust lay thick on the floor. The relief she experienced

[1] In addition to the Coronation sermon by the Right Rev. George Johnstone Jeffrey, which appeared last month, it might be noticed that the subject for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity is also suitable for the Coronation season.

when she discovered the coin, and the obtrusive sympathy of her neighbours were eloquent witness to the importance which she and they attached to its recovery.

Now all this story is designed by Jesus to be a window into the heart of God. God thinks of us and feels and acts towards us as this woman did to this coin. He grieves over 'that which is lost' and exerts every effort, and seeks the co-operation of others, to secure the recovery of the lost. The same substantial truth is taught in the previous Parable of the Straying Sheep, but there are special features of this redemptive task brought out in this Parable which call for separate treatment, and to these we now turn.

First of all we have in this Parable a new idea of what it means to be 'lost.' The lost are usually in our view like the Prodigal Son who took the bit between his teeth, and recklessly squandered his patrimony in riotous living. But here is another and rarer conception of lostness. We are lost when, like this coin, we go out of currency, when we withdraw our faculties and gifts from the uses for which they were designed.

Men and women are lost, in Christ's view, when they withhold their contribution from the common pool. We sometimes speak scornfully of people as being 'good-for-nothing.' That precisely describes Christ's view of lostness. This was a leading idea of His, as we can see from the fruitless fig-tree, the one-talented man, the denatured salt, and other instances. The rascals of the Gospel are not so much those who abuse their gifts as those who disuse them. A man must be good for something.

There is a second suggestion here about the way men get lost. How was this coin lost? Some one let the coin slip and it fell by its own dead weight. Perhaps the carelessness may arise through our own fault. A sudden gust of temptation sweeps us off our feet, so that we lose control of our higher powers, and the dead weight of the down-dragging tendencies of our nature flings us into the grime and gutter of life. Sometimes and, as the Parable seems to suggest, usually, it is something in our environment that wrests from us the control of our lives, so that we fall and become useless to God and men. Recently I listened to a Welfare Officer's experiences in the homes of problem children in a certain county in Scotland. The sordid conditions in which he found these homes was almost unbelievable. What possible chance do children have of running a straight race through life when almost from the womb they are cursed and damned by a filthy environment?

At the risk of contradicting what I have just said another point that should be noticed is the place where the coin was lost. It was lost in the home. That is rather startling. Lost in the world, yes! Lost in the wilderness, yes! Lost in the far country, yes! But surely it was not lost in the home. Certainly not in the homes which are the shrine of all the pieties and the soil of social sympathies. Most certainly these precious human coins will be lost in the filthy homes I have mentioned before. But there is another type of home where the same disastrous result may take place. It is the type of home where parents and children live for themselves alone, and draw iron curtains between themselves and the clamant needs of God's Kingdom and their fellow-men. Such homes are not social but private units, appropriating the riches of society without distributing them. A Glasgow business friend of mine said to me recently: 'My conviction is, as the result of a long experience, that most business men I have known have dwarfed their nature because they are quite content to confine all their interest to their home and business, and to neglect the great affairs of city and state.' I have often heard ministers and their wives complain that they are so busy attending to the duties of public life that they have too little time to look after their own children. Yet generally speaking the children turn out well, and this is largely due to the fact that they have unconsciously imbibed in the home the spirit of public service. I am not suggesting we should neglect our homes, but in point of fact we are doing this if we do not teach our children to put their gifts into circulation and not allow them to be lost within the walls of home.

There is a further suggestion here of the intrinsic value of the lost coin. Although the coin is lost, it is not useless. Dust-begrimed and even partially defaced it may be, but it still bears the image of the King, and is potentially fit for the royal service. The moment it is put into circulation it acquires its original value. That is one of the lessons Jesus would have us learn here. Lost men and women have not through their lostness become valueless in themselves or in God's sight. They still bear the mark of their heavenly origin. They have not erased by their sin the image of God from their hearts. They do not, by falling, forfeit the original uses for which God designed them. They are still coins, meet for the King's service, on condition that they do not lie uselessly in the dust, but become active agents for good, circulating on His Majesty's service.

This becomes clearer when we reflect upon the efforts made to recover the lost coin. The woman searches the house *diligently*. She lights a candle that she may see more clearly the object of her search. She uses a broom and sweeps up the thick dust lying on the floor, and scrutinizes it carefully. She searches every cranny, every corner, every crack, if haply she may find it. The main idea is

the thoroughness of the search. This sheds a glow of light on the earnestness of God's search for the lost. Jesus Himself is the best commentary on this search. 'The Son of man is come to *seek* and to save that which was lost.' Is it fanciful to suggest a hint of His method under the figure of the candle and the broom? Is the candle meant to indicate the light of Divine truth by which He seeks to bring men to themselves? Is it not the case that Jesus relies for the recovery of the lost on the appealing power of His message? And the search is often attended with much dust and confusion. It is certainly true that the task of persuading men and women to abandon their useless and unprofitable ways of living means a revolution in their thoughts and habits. The cottage of our individual lives may be thrown into a state of turbulence and confusion.

Let us now in conclusion bring all this down to the practical and personal. Are we like this lost coin? Are we doing nothing with our gifts and powers? Are we withholding from the service of our King the contribution we might well make? Are we a lost militant force in the striking power of God's great army? If such be the case, then the lesson of this Parable is that God's heart is very sad. And He is sad although it be only one person who treats Him so, one lost sheep, one lost coin. And Jesus told this Parable that we might all of us know that by all the wonderful ways of His grace and truth, by the ministry of His own Incarnation and Cross, by the compulsion of His love, and power of His Spirit, God is putting forth His utmost effort to restore to usefulness every blighted life. And when we are restored to His royal service and exercise our gifts in setting forth His purpose for us, in us, and through us, we banish the shadow from His heart and fill all heaven with rejoicing.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Safeguarding the Faith

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A.,
CATHCART, GLASGOW

'That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.'—2 Ti 1[14].

The key-word in this text would seem to be a favourite of St. Paul's. Twice in this chapter the Apostle uses it. Four times in his letters to Timothy he employs it.

It really means 'deposit' and behind it lies a picture. A widow, it may be, has been left some money or, may be, the family estate. Out of respect for the past as well as of necessity she desires to preserve it. She therefore takes the inheritance—the money or the title deeds—to the Temple. There she leaves it in sacred trust with the priest, who offers a prayer that God will protect it and guarantee its safe custody.

That is the practice that the word brings to mind. Paul is depositing with Timothy (as Moffatt puts it) the securities of the faith.

Was it a pastor's manual Paul was entrusting to Timothy? Some think that already the essentials of the faith had been formulated, may be by Luke who had set them out in a book which is now passing into the possession of Timothy. 'See that these truths are strictly adhered to. This is what you have to teach, nothing less and nothing more. Guard it.'

Or was it simply the gospel as it had been communicated by word of mouth to Timothy? Those were the days of the oral tradition. The use of the imagination in making the facts of the faith live might unwittingly lead to a major alteration. The elaboration of them so as to make them personal and relevant might result in their distortion. 'See that the faith committed to your charge is uncorrupted and undefiled. Guard it.'

Strong were the influences in the days of Timothy that might corrupt the gospel. As it travelled through the lands and provinces of Eastern Europe and Asia Minor it might suffer loss, elements essential to it being extracted, or it might acquire ideas and doctrines that were extraneous and contradictory to it. It had to be safeguarded.

Defend it against moral defilement, says Paul. You are living in a world of gross paganism where low standards pander to the flesh. Subtle and plausible will be the persuasions with which people will seek to lower the high morality of the Christian faith. Make your requirements flexible and they will win men's hearts. Then you will be able to guide them step by step towards the exalted levels of the Christian ethic. Have none of it, says Paul. Keep the moral standards of Christian discipleship pure.

Preserve it from spiritual corruption, says Paul. Remember the gospel is striving for the allegiance of men against other religions. Some are crude and fantastic and some are learned and philosophical but all will seek to defeat the Christian faith by devious methods. They will lure you into a fatal accommodation if they can. For example, they believe that between God and man the relationship is effected through emanations of angels—a series of heavenly spirits linking the evil of man with the holiness of God. 'Why not accept the idea?' you will be tempted to ask. 'Claim that Jesus is the greatest of these spiritual

beings. He is the nearest to God, His well beloved Son.' Have no compromise with such doctrines.

To us the same gospel has been entrusted. From us the same vigilance, the same unflinching and uncompromising defence is demanded.

In every age the gospel has been exposed to the danger of modification. Its moral demands have always seemed too severe for our frail humanity. The common man cannot be as unselfish and loving and good as it requires. Be sensible. Moderate your demands. And, of course, it is difficult. Every one who has tried realizes how hard it is to translate the moral precepts of Christ into reality. It often means being caught in the relentless grip of a tormenting conscience. Nevertheless we dare not make concessions. However impossible and absurd it may appear, we are bound to adhere with the most exacting devotion to His word.

So, too, the Christian faith has had to contend with other religions and other ideas. What a battle it has been to keep it inviolate! Cloaked in innocence, the dangerous beliefs lay their assault. After all, they say, you must make Christianity acceptable or people just won't receive it. And before we know we have stripped it of its supernaturalism, its uniqueness, and its power. Or they say, use the ideas already reigning in people's minds to interpret the faith. Look how St. John employed the idea of the Logos to commend Christ. But the trouble is that the interpreters we invite as guests have the habit of remaining as residents. Or they will say, don't be intolerant. After all, God has never left Himself without a witness. Give Him His place among the great religious leaders of the world and He will gain people's respect. So the very foundation on which the gospel rests is undermined. For there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

As much to-day as ever we are called to be the vigilant custodians of the gospel. But how?

By studying it. Surely it is axiomatic that if you keep close to its origins you will preserve it. How we ever expected to preserve the integrity of the faith without giving diligent attention to its sources, I cannot imagine. Yet that is how we have been behaving. We have allowed its flaming truth to be diluted because we have not drunk from its spring. 'I have passed my life,' Anatole France once said, 'twisting dynamite into curl papers.' Our Christianity has tended to lose its explosive power, its capacity to destroy the evil of the world and change it because we have not chosen our weapons from the armoury of the Bible.

By practising it. For the faith is not so much an intellectual exercise as a spiritual obligation. The perseverance of the saints has preserved the gospel for us but only because they applied themselves by rigorous, dogged plodding, vigilant persistence to the practice of the faith. They experienced the peace and joy of the forgiveness of God because they forgave those who trespassed against them. They were convinced of the reality of the love of God and of its power to save because they themselves loved the children of God and transmitted His salvation with astounding results. Once there was an American leader called Eugene Debs. His heart was consumed with the love of the Lord Jesus Christ, and for what he believed to be his Christian duty he was thrown into prison. There he met and became the friend of a negro serving a life-long sentence. 'Gene Debs was the only Jesus Christ I ever knew,' was his comment as he explained to his warder the extraordinary effect on him of Debs' friendship. I remember sitting in a car, listening enchanted and awed to an elderly friend describing in almost lyrical terms what the Lord Jesus Christ meant to him. This was the first time he had ever spoken to me of these personal things; but I had known him since my boyhood days and he has always been the man who, above all others, has embodied for me what it means to be a Christian. He had kept the faith because he had given it free course in his life.

By spreading it. The clarity with which we apprehend the Christian faith depends on our power to communicate it. Nothing strengthens our hold upon it like our effort to transmit it. I have read a story of a young country minister going to his old theological Professor to share with him the joy and thrill of a wonderful revival that had spontaneously and mysteriously broken out in his congregation. But the old Professor was a strange man, unlike any whom I know. He looked at the young man, flushed with the ecstasy of his spiritual exaltation, and said, 'Can nothing be done to stop it?' I do not know who he was or what his subject but I am persuaded his instruction would not be based on the full gospel committed to the saints. It is preserved only by its communication and proves its authenticity by its power to convert.

Study, practise, spread! These are the activities in which we faithfully discharge our trust in preserving the gospel. But, Paul reminds Timothy, they are the activities not of man but of the Holy Spirit. This is the way the Holy Spirit works, taking of the things of Christ and revealing them to us, engrafting us into the life of Christ so that He lives in us, making effective our evangelism so that men believe. It is the mark of a man who is guarding the securities of the faith that he is letting the Holy Spirit, in these ways, work through him.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Kingdoms of Man and the Kingdom of God

BY THE REVEREND G. PRESTON MACLEOD, CALGARY, ALBERTA, CANADA

'Every Christian ought to obey the civil authorities, for all legitimate authority is derived from God's Authority, and the existing authority is appointed under God . . . the civil authorities are appointed by God for the good purposes of public order and well-being.'—Ro $13^{1.6}$ (J. B. Phillips' translation).

Our beloved Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, will be crowned by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the second day of June 1953, in historic Westminster Abbey amid great public rejoicing. Christian people will join with all citizens in the heart-felt cry, 'God save the Queen.' What abundant cause for gratitude there is in this heritage of free peoples, who, up to and including their Sovereign, are committed by long-established principles to humble acknowledgment of the Kingdom of God above the kingdoms of man.

The tension between these two allegiances has so often been so great. This century has seen as extreme examples of it as have ever existed. There have been, and are, political-ecclesiastical alliances which deliberately suppress freedom and human rights. On the other hand, there have been, and are, godless, secular tyrannies which dominate the Church, determined to make even the soul's approach to God subservient to their own ends. In both cases the sinful pride of man challenges and frustrates the good design of God.

The New Testament reveals two very different attitudes toward political authority. Their apparent contradiction must be interpreted in the light of the very different situations which called them forth.

In the first place, the Bible relates many instances of resistance to earthly authority, some of them commendable, and some not. Their justification, or otherwise, is to be determined by the prevailing principle of Judaism and historic Christianity that secular government, in its nature and intention, is of Divine institution, 'for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.'

In the time of Jesus, the Zealots sought political independence from Rome by conspiracy, assassination, and violent rebellion. They vainly tried to enlist our Lord in their underground resistance movement, just as the political wing of the Pharisees tried to involve Him, for opposite reasons, in the compromises of fanatical nationalism. His answer to the latter, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's,' was not an admission that government is an autonomous realm, independent of God. It was, rather, an affirmation that all of life is under God, and it carried to all parties a warning that their stubborn national pride was actually precipitating the tragic disasters which their folly brought upon the nation in the terrible wars with Rome a scant generation after the Crucifixion.

The Apocalypse denounces the Roman imperial power as Babylon—the extreme symbol of ancient pagan tyranny—with violent epithets and vituperation. The background is one of persecution and martyrdom for Christians who would not forswear their allegiance to Christ. Compulsory Cæsar worship and repeated outbreaks of religious suppression forced Christians to their death. Nazi and Communist policies in our own day have illustrated all too tragically the reason for the hostility of the Apocalypse to secular power. It was an assertion of spiritual freedom against the domination of the Totalitarian State.

The opening chapters of Acts relate how Peter and John with the other apostles had to defy civil authority in order to make the earliest proclamations of the gospel, resolutely affirming, 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' Following in their train, Tyndale, Latimer and Ridley, Knox, Milton, Bunyan, and a host of witnesses have built our heritage of freedom.

In sharp contrast is the teaching of the Apostle Paul regarding the Christian attitude toward political power. He viewed the State in its wider context. Even though he was often the centre of local mob violence, even though Rome took away his life at last, he had been rescued from riot and violent death by the officers of Roman law and order. He owed his life to Roman rule. His appeal to Cæsar was an appeal for justice and fair trial under the ultimate sanctions of the Law. Perhaps to counteract fanatical world-denying tendencies in the Church, Paul emphasizes in his letter to Roman Christians the Divine sanction underlying institutions of government—even the Roman rule. Civil authority is part of the natural moral order, appointed by God for the defence and encouragement of those who desire to live at peace with their neighbours in harmonious community.

It follows that there are limits and conditions to the power of secular rulers. When they persistently violate the moral law, or compel their subjects to do violence to their plain duty to God, they are to be challenged in the name of God from whom their lawful authority derives. Far from being a doctrine of quietism or irresponsible subservience, this principle that civil authority is derived from God becomes the very foundation of justice and freedom. Christians were able to overcome the abuses of secular power, not by

repudiating all human government, but by affirming this very principle, which establishes the Christian truth that nations, as well as individuals, are accountable to God.

Furthermore, Paul found it necessary to warn Christians against the opposite extreme. Christians are not to be politically irresponsible, socially indifferent, or mistakenly unworldly. They are not to neglect the duties of a subject to just authority, nor to encourage anarchy by persuading every man to be a law unto himself. For behind and above and within the kingdoms of man is the Kingdom of God.

Whether the relationship between Christianity and democracy is a necessary relationship or not, it is, none the less, a fact of history, and a glorious thing, that our political heritage is rooted in the Christian religion. At this Coronation time we should think more deeply on the wonderful development of the British conception of kingship in the history of human institutions.

How often in the record of

> old, unhappy, far-off things,
> And battles long ago

the British people were against their King! In 1215 there was Magna Carta—the barons against the King. In 1642 there was the Civil War, followed by the Protectorate—the people against the King and barons, and freedom-loving Christians against religious dominations by the State. In 1688 there was the crowning of William and Mary, and the Bill of Rights—the guarantee of the people's liberties against political and religious absolutism. In 1776 came the American War of Independence—the rejection by the people of a new land of reactionary colonial rule. In that struggle Canada took what has turned out to be not a contradictory but a parallel course, leading to freedom without violence and national maturity without separation. Now the Commonwealth acclaims its Sovereign in utterly unique relationships of freedom. Our present gracious Queen personalizes, humanizes, and focuses for every party in the realm, for people of every occupation and status, the principle of government in freedom, and, in a great family tradition, the Christian ideals of personal and social life without which respect for human dignity and brotherhood could not have taken root among us and cannot long endure in this kind of world.

So by a strange paradox, these lands which acknowledge allegiance to the Queen have become custodians of human liberty and foremost champions of the rights of man, because both Sovereign and people are pledged to acknowledge the Headship of Christ over the nations, while lands where man has asserted his freedom to be a law unto himself have betrayed their liberty to dictators and lost it to tyrants.

There is deep spiritual meaning in the ceremony of the Coronation. When the Archbishop of Canterbury delivers to the Queen the Orb surmounted by a Cross, symbol of earthly rule, he pronounces these solemn words: 'Receive this Orb set under the Cross, and remember that the whole world is subject to the Power and Empire of Christ our Redeemer.'

When the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland places in the Sovereign's hands the Holy Bible he says: 'Here is Wisdom; This is the royal Law; These are the lively Oracles of God.'

The magnificent symbolism represents a reality in our heritage, not 'the divine right of kings,' but the Divine sanction of both the right to rule and the duty to exercise free citizenship under the moral law. Our freedoms historically stem from the open Bible, the sovereignty of God and the universal faith in the Kingdom of God overruling the kingdoms of man.

'The powers that be are ordained of God . . . for they are God's ministers.' They are not a law unto themselves. That is our defence against tyranny. It is also our summons to social and political responsibility. Our practice falls far short of our professions, but at our best we have been a believing people. If we go on to be a greatly believing people the best is yet to be. That brings the issue right down to the point where Paul always left it—our personal response. Whether we continue to commend to the world the ideals of freedom and a strong witness for the Kingdom of God above the kingdoms of man, depends on the kind of people we are, seek increasingly to be, and encourage one another to become, the kind of people whose personal faith inspires them to go beyond what the law requires, to put into life the love which is 'the fulfilling of the law.'

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Christ and Our Littleness

BY THE REVEREND JAMES WRIGHT, M.A.,
BOAT OF GARTEN

'He was little of stature.'—Lk 19^3.

Our Lord had a particular sympathy for people like Zacchaeus with a physical abnormality. Life is a harder battle for them, a harder economic battle and a harder moral battle. They have a struggle to keep their handicap from creating a twist in their nature. Napoleon might not have chosen the way of bloodshed and tyranny had he been an inch or two taller.

Certainly the smallness of Zacchaeus explains

much of his character and career. He was tiny, from childhood, a target for insults and bullying, and that begot in him the resolve to be a big man. Yes, one to be looked up to, not down on.

The most obvious way to that goal—then as now—was to become a rich man, and the easiest route to wealth for a Jew of that day was to take service as a taxgatherer under the Roman masters of the country. So in time Zacchaeus became a chief taxgatherer and very wealthy, with a conspicuously large house on the higher and airier ground above the stuffy town of Jericho.

It is, however, not only the physically undersized but all of us who are face to face with this problem of littleness. It is, in fact, our human problem.

We are small because so *puny*. One school of psychology held that what chiefly colours the mental outlook of human beings and is the fundamental element in their psychical make-up is that they are weak and vulnerable creatures. Through the ages little man has had to make his way with giants towering over and terrifying him—wild beasts, wild men, famine, pestilence, and death. We all feel like the fisherman who prays, ' Have mercy on me, O God. Thine ocean is so large and my boat so small.'

Man is small, too, because so *petty*—so morally infantile. Jesus called His disciples children, even little children, adults though they were. When He saw the big fisherman Peter so eager to be first and the rest so jealous of his priority, their Master thought, ' What bairns they are for grown men.' ' Of what toys we make our joys,' sings Coventry Patmore. What silly things please us and displease us ! We purr when we are praised though we know it is flattery and are made miserable and sulky by criticism though we know it to be deserved and salutary. It gives us satisfaction to see a neighbour discredited and raises envy in us when he is fortunate. People say to us sometimes, ' Be your age.' They might say it every day.

Zacchaeus' plan to cope with his *puniness* was to erect a barrier of wealth against the hostility and bullying which threatened him—to feel big and strong and safe because he was rich. It failed completely. He remained cowed and insecure. Palestine was at that period always on the verge of revolt against the Roman conquerors and well Zacchaeus knew that if such a revolt succeeded, he and his kind would be the first to hang.

Wealth still appeals to men as their surest safeguard against life's mischances. It will keep the big bad wolves from the door—but it does not. The germs of disease can get through the chinks and death walk through as though the door were not there. Not in our revolutionary age can any man feel safe because he has money. They used to say in Lancashire ' Three generations from clogs to clogs,' from poverty to affluence and back to poverty again, but less than three generations will serve now. Russian Counts became Paris taxi-drivers and the sons of county gentlemen dealers in second-hand cars in a much shorter time. The rich man remains puny with the problem of vulnerability very much on his hands.

Zacchaeus' plan to deal with his *pettiness* met with no greater success. He would prosper, have a fine house, and people would respect him and he would respect himself. Instead, others despised him more than ever. He went up the sycamore tree not only to get a better sight of Jesus but to escape what the neighbours might say about him and to him. I am sure they called him ' a little worm,' and a little worm he felt himself to be. He had become a quisling solely to make money, and no man could do that and not feel that he had sunk very low.

Our frantic efforts to overcome our moral childishness meet no better fate. They rather aggravate it. We are constantly trying to win a better reputation for character than we deserve by boasting of our good points, subtly or blatantly, but others see through us and we shrink in their esteem, and in our own for we know we have played the hypocrite. We try to magnify ourselves by belittling others. People may enjoy hearing it but they don't admire the man who does it and it is no way to ' heal us of our self-despising.'

And so for half a life-time Zacchaeus put up a gallant and determined but unsuccessful fight to get the better of his littleness. And then he encountered Jesus, and was cured. No longer does he behave as one who is frightened of what men and chance can do to him. He has thrown away his only defence against them, the defence to which he trusted for protection—his money. In one sentence, he strips himself bare. ' Half of my goods I give to the poor,' and as for the other half, if he kept his word to repay fourfold all he had unjustly extorted, and if he had been a rogue like the other publicans of his time, he would have little of it left. Jesus named him well ' A son of Abraham.' He was going out not knowing whither he went, but no longer afraid.

No one can help looking up to this little man now. It was ' big ' of him to do what he did—it was magnanimous, it was magnificent. You have to use adjectives with largeness in them to describe it. He is now a Greatheart.

And how did the miracle, for miracle it certainly is, happen ? It happened because Jesus took notice of him. Alone of all the men in that crowd, Zacchaeus was addressed by his name. That made the despised, diminutive taxgatherer begin

to feel a bigger man. Then Jesus indicated that He was deserting the crowd and going to spend the day with Zacchaeus at his house. A Good Man, a Man of God was to cross the threshold of that lonely home where no friendly foot ever came. That made him feel of still greater consequence. He overheard, too, the mutterings of the crowd against Jesus for taking up with the hated quisling and realized that to make a friend of him meant making enemies of others. And when, a little later, word came to Jericho that Jesus had been crucified at Jerusalem, Zacchaeus knew it was for stretching out the hand of kindness to such as he that Jesus had died. Jesus thought him worth that—so he discovered his infinite value.

Yes, infinite value, for Zacchaeus must have felt that there was more than a Good Man, even a Man of God, in this. It was so wonderful, so generous, so utterly beyond human capacity that God must be in it. God it was who had sought him and singled him out and sacrificed for him. Why should he be any longer frightened? What better protection is available than the care of the Almighty? When we know that we are under that protection, the giant forces which keep us in dread terrify no longer.

By the same means the pettiness of Zacchaeus passed away, and he was no longer a little worm, but a man to look up to. Christ had shown him how large he bulked in God's scale of values. It has been known for a man with no artistic sense to possess a masterpiece of a picture and use it to paper the side of a room with the picture to the wall. Later the wall was stripped, and there was one at hand who knew its worth. Thereafter it was treated with the honour and respect which it deserved. When Christ has revealed to you by His love and Cross your infinite importance, you will treat yourself with the respect you deserve and treat others for whom also He died with the same respect.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Two Aspects of Religion

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., EDINBURGH

'Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank.'—Dn 1^{8}.

'When Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime.'—Dn 6^{10}.

In one of his books a distinguished Old Testament scholar makes the striking statement that Daniel was known in Babylon, not less by the things he did than by the things he refused to do. 'The things a man refuses to share in,' he goes on to say, 'are occasional, and may be the outcome of special circumstances among which he happens to be thrown. The things which he always does at the dictate of his faith are the constant and richer evidence of the manner of man he is.'

Daniel, along with others, chose to remain in Babylon after the main body of his people had returned to their own land from which they had been carried captive. Entering into the life of the country of his adoption, in which, apparently, the Jews were perfectly free to exercise their gifts, he made good, winning for himself a place in the esteem and the confidence of the king himself. Steady as his advancement was, however, Daniel, though serving the temporal interests of Babylon, never forgot that he was a Jew who had an obligation to be true to the law of his God which contained, among other things, regulations about food and drink. Men could reckon him odd if they were so inclined, but nothing they might say or do could affect his loyalty to his convictions. And this negative side of his religion, it is worth noting, helped to secure him his place in the esteem and the confidence of the king. Finding Daniel and his friends a disciplined set of youths, and fit because disciplined, he trusted them.

But there was, we do well to remember, a positive side to Daniel's religion. The law of his God instructed him also in the things he must not neglect to do. And among these the necessity for seeking God in prayer stood high. If the negative side of his religion might have proved an embarrassment to him, so, equally, might the positive side. Even when the king, duped by jealous colleagues of Daniel who wished to effect the young Jew's downfall, issued a decree that none save himself must be worshipped, Daniel 'kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime.' That took courage. But courage was never in short supply where Daniel was concerned.

Is it not true to say that the religion of every true Christian must have a negative and a positive side to it?

1. So far as the negative side of religion is concerned, some not very well informed people would have us believe that it is wholly confined to the Old Testament whose teaching was long ago superseded by the positive teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ.

They are in error to this extent, that the Lord Jesus, whose teaching was essentially positive, made it clear on more than one occasion that there are certain things no true follower of His will ever consent to do. Listen, for example, to

this utterance of His. 'Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.' Could anything be more explicit than that? It is said that the ermine can be trapped by surrounding it with a circle of filth. It will die before it will sully its snowy coat. There would appear to be evidence that the Lord Jesus Christ cherished this expectation of His followers that rather than do or say certain things they would prefer to be torn limb from limb.

Some of us may persuade ourselves that there is no negative side to the teaching of Jesus because now, as when Daniel lived and witnessed, failure to keep in step with the crowd may mean embarrassment. But the negative side, however we may try, on grounds of cowardice, to forget it, cannot be so easily disposed of. Listen to this other utterance of our Lord. 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.' Could anything be more explicit than that?

The fact which we must face to-day is that a world in which so many would have us believe that there is no self-denial in the teaching of Jesus, in which so many would have us believe that there is no such thing as an absolute standard, is a most unhappy place where countless individuals by their appearance, if not by their lips, betray their complete disillusionment.

In such a setting there is a place for men and women who are prepared to witness as Daniel witnessed in Babylon long ago. The Lord Jesus Christ likened His followers to a light set upon a hill which gives light to the country round about, and to salt which preserves and purifies. And when He did so He believed not only that, under God, men could be found with courage enough to illumine and to purify life, but that, under God, their witness would be blessed to many and not least to those who long ago abandoned absolute values and who have come to own in the secret of their hearts that in loyalty to absolute values lies their only hope of peace.

2. But religion, if it is to be real religion, must have a positive as well as a negative side to it.

Some unfriendly critics of the Church would have us believe that the Church has lost sight entirely of this positive side of religion, that she raises her voice only to protest against something, to prevent or to curtail people's enjoyment of legitimate pleasures. All of which is far from the truth. 'No other religion,' says Dr. Kraemer, the distinguished Dutch Professor, writing of Christianity, 'offers a parallel to the overwhelming compassion and solicitude for distant and utterly foreign fellow-creatures which has manifested itself for generations in the sustained prayer and giving of the missionary church at home, and in the obedience to the call of those who went abroad. All the common human admixtures of romanticism, love for adventure or for the exotic, and the subconscious desire for self-realization, do not wipe out the fact that this movement drew and draws its inspiration from the vision of "the city which hath foundations, whose maker and builder is God."'

Likewise, it might be proved in case after case that movements designed to increase the sum of human well-being owed their beginning and their continuance to the zeal of individual Christian men and women who had a desire to do something positive in the Name and for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ.

And, yet, there *is* a danger that we may confine ourselves to the negative side of our religion, that we, because we refrain from doing what others do, may come to pride ourselves, like the Pharisee in our Lord's parable, that we are not as other men are, forgetting all the time that, while our Lord declared emphatically that there are certain things His followers should never permit themselves to do, there are tasks and duties and services which they should be foremost in undertaking.

We do well to recollect that in our Lord's parable of the Last Judgment some commended themselves, not by reason of the things they had refrained from doing, but by reason of the things which they had done. 'Come ye blessed of my Father,' they heard the Judge of all men say, 'inherit the kingdom prepared for you, for inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me.'

I wonder if you remember a poem by Marguerite Wilkinson?

> I never cut my neighbour's throat;
> My neighbour's gold I never stole;
> I never spoiled his house and land;
> *But God have mercy on my soul!*
>
> For I am haunted night and day
> By all the deeds I have not done;
> O unattempted loveliness!
> O costly valour never won!

'The things a man refuses to share in,' says the distinguished scholar to whom I referred at the beginning, 'are occasional, and may be the outcome of special circumstances among which he happens to be thrown. The things which he always does at the dictate of his faith are the constant and richer evidence of the manner of man he is.'

The Date of Luke-Acts

By the Reverend C. S. C. Williams, M.A., Merton College, Oxford

This short article[1] is to suggest that St. Luke sent as his *πρῶτος λόγος* to Theophilus not his Gospel, as is so often assumed, but an early draft of Gospel material, such as Proto-Luke, in a form not of a complete Gospel but of a collection of sayings and doings of the Lord; that he then wrote Acts; and that he then revised the Third Gospel, basing it chronologically on a copy of Mark's Gospel, which had come into his hands before he wrote Acts but not before the 'early draft.'

On this theory Luke purposely omitted from his final revision of the Gospel the Markan material to which he had alluded in Acts. Ac 1^{7}, *οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*, picks up Mk 13^{32}, *περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατηρ.* Lk 21^{33} omits this Markan verse. Similarly Ac 6^{11-12} may contain allusions to Mk $14^{58.\ 64}$. Again, Ac 12^{4}, *βουλόμενος μετὰ τὸ πάσχα ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ λαῷ*, picks up Mk 14^{2}, *ἔλεγον γάρ μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ*, which Lk 22^{2} omits though 22^{6} may refer to it, *εὐκαιρίαν . . . ἄτερ ὄχλου*. Similarly Ac 9^{40}, *ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας* picks up Mk 5^{40}, *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας*, which Luke omits from his parallel (Lk 8^{53}). In much the same way Josephus in treating of an incident common to his *Bell. Jud.*, I. viii. 178 and his *Ant.* xiv. 103 borrowed from the same passage in Thucydides, i. 128, but he did so without repeating himself by using one phrase from Thucydides in one work, another in the other. On this view Luke consciously or not assimilated some of the actions of the Apostles in Acts to those of Jesus but carefully omitted from his Gospel later all such allusions.

An objection against the theory may be urged by those who maintain that a collection of Q and L material, such as Proto-Luke is assumed to be, must reflect the historical situation after A.D. 70, and that, therefore, this theory is of no value for dating Acts. But what weight is there in this objection? The material peculiar to Lk 19^{11-27} is not necessarily of a late date even if in 19^{14} the Evangelist had Archelaus in mind and the Jewish envoys who begged Rome not to let him rule over them. These events, with which Josephus happens to deal in *Bell. Jud.*, II. vi. 80–100, had occurred long before Josephus arrived in Rome and drafted his lost Aramaic 'first edition' of the War after Jerusalem fell, and they were widely known. There is no need to postulate Luke's dependence on Josephus here or elsewhere. Again, Jesus' lamentation over Jerusalem in Lk 19^{41-44} does not prove that Luke composed it after A.D. 70. Jesus was at least a prophet. 'To describe these verses as a Christian composition after the event is the kind of extravagance that brings sober criticism into disrepute,' wrote T. W. Manson.[2] The language of *v.* 43 f. is derived from the Septuagint, as C. H. Dodd proved conclusively.[3] The words are taken from such passages as Is 29^{3} 37^{33}, Ezk 4^{1-2}, Jer 52^{4-5}, Hag 2^{15}. Again, the phrase peculiar to Lk in 21^{11}, 'and there shall be terrors and great signs from heaven,' need not be taken to show dependence on Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, VI. v. 288–300, where he gives a list of the portents of the end, even if this Lukan phrase stood in his 'early draft.' Again Lk 21^{20-24} is often taken to prove that whereas Mark had written before A.D. 70, Luke, who mentions 'Jerusalem surrounded by armies' must have written after the event. But it is more likely that we have here in Mk 13^{14-20} and Lk 21^{20-24} 'two independent versions of the prediction' (Manson, *op. cit.*, 329 f.). As Dr. Dodd proved, there is nothing here that Luke could not have derived from the LXX: 'the conception of the coming disaster which the author has in mind is a generalized picture of the fall of Jerusalem as imaginatively presented by the prophets. So far as any historical event has coloured the picture, it is not Titus's capture of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but Nebuchadrezzar's capture in 586 B.C.'[4] It may indeed be argued that Luke purposely avoided including Mk 13^{18}, 'And pray ye that it be not in the winter,' and that as the siege took place in the summer this omission indicates that he wrote after the siege; but this argument would not conflict with the theory suggested here that when Luke had a copy of Mark in his hands he wrote Acts and then revised his 'early draft' of Gospel material on the basis of Mark. Our immediate purpose is to show that any material which could be included as L material and therefore belonging possibly to the 'early draft' was not necessarily written after A.D. 70. Again, there is nothing in the story peculiar to

[1] Cf. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xlix. [1948], 54, and A. H. McNeile, *Introduction to the New Testament*[2] [1953], 34.

[2] *The Sayings of Jesus* [1949], 320.

[3] *The Journal of Roman Studies*, xxxvii. [1947], 46–54.

[4] *Ib.* 52.

Luke of the women who wept over Jesus (23^{27-31}) that could not have been written before the city was captured; the words of Hos 10^{8} are borrowed to show that the sufferings of the Jews would be so intense that they would pray for a natural catastrophe to end them. To support this theory that Luke's writings were (*a*) an early draft of Gospel material, (*b*) Acts, then (*c*) the Third Gospel in that order, one might argue that nowhere does Luke recount the horrors of the siege in detail as Josephus was to do and that had Luke known them he must have referred to them (cf. *Bell. Jud.*, VI. iii. 201 ff.), but it may well be that Josephus exaggerated the horrors to excuse himself for being a renegade giving help to the Romans instead of being with his fellow-Jews inside the capital. Voltaire rightly said '*L'exagérateur Josèphe!*' He accused his fellow-Jews of cannibalism; but '*qui s'excuse, s'accuse*' and '*qui accuse, s'excuse!*'

If this theory is accepted, it may be easier to understand why Acts ends so abruptly as it does, at least according to the Alexandrian text, and why it leaves St. Paul under 'house-arrest' without relating his end. Had news of St. Paul's death reached Luke when he wrote Acts? It is easier to suppose that it had not than that he intended to be vague about an event with which he must have been familiar if he wrote at a considerable time after the Neronian persecution or than that he intended to produce a sequel to Acts. The later the date we assign to Acts in the first century A.D., the harder it is to account for Luke's silence about Paul's death and for Luke's lack of knowledge of the Pauline epistles in some collection. When we examine Ac 16^{3} and 21^{21} we seem to find indications 'that at the time when Acts was written a Jewish Christianity was still flourishing, and that the Pauline Christians were anxious to establish the compromise that Jews should continue to practise circumcision but Gentiles should not adopt it, and that circumcised and uncircumcised should recognize the correctness of each other's customs. By the second century this question was almost dead, but when Luke wrote it obviously was important, at least in Jerusalem. Was it elsewhere? Probably not after A.D. 70' (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. i. vol. iv. p. 271). Why do so many scholars, even if they refuse rightly to believe that Luke was dependent on Josephus, date Acts late in the first century and treat him as though he was 'consciously archaeologizing'?

According to the theory propounded here, the *terminus a quo* for Acts need not be any longer the date of the Lukan Gospel. If we had to seek for a new *terminus a quo* for Acts, should we find it in the words of Paul to the high-priest Ananias (Ac 23^{3}), supposing them to be a *vaticinium ex eventu*? Ananias, son of Nebedaeus, was assassinated in A.D. 66. Before that same year the 'Zealots' did not exist as a party with that name. In the years between A.D. 66 and 70 Luke may have become familiar with a copy of Mark on which (perhaps after A.D. 70) he was to base his final version of the Third Gospel. He may well have intended to revise Acts later; this book shows indications of a lack of final revision.

Lastly, what of the two accounts of the Ascension, one at the end of the Lukan Gospel, the other at the beginning of Acts? The present writer has followed Streeter elsewhere in the view that Lk 24^{51} is Lukan despite the Western omission which was due to the implication of this verse that the Ascension took place on the day of the Resurrection and to Ac $1^{3ff.}$ intentionally correcting that implication by intercalating a period of 'forty days' (*Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 51 ff.). There is no evidence elsewhere in the New Testament for such a period between the Resurrection and the Ascension. Is it not possible to argue on the theory outlined here that the account in the Gospel 'corrected' that in Acts, not vice versa?

Recent Foreign Theology

The Single Eye. A Swedish doctoral dissertation by Conny Edlund has been devoted to the study of Mt $6^{22f.}$ and Lk $11^{34f.}$, under the title *The Eye of Singleness*.[1] The writer first examines the chosen verses in the light of their context, and underlines the antithesis between ἁπλοῦς and πονηρός. In his Preface he cites the words of H. J. Cadbury that Mt $6^{22f.}$, with its reference to the single eye, 'at best carries a metaphor too far, but the original meaning is lost to most modern readers.' In order to recover this meaning Dr. Edlund turns to study the background of the use of ἁπλοῦς in the Old Testament use of תָּמִים, תֹּם, הֹם, and in the use of ἁπλότης, ἁπλοῦς, ἁπλῶς in the intertestamental period. He next examines these Greek words in their general New Testament usage before coming to his brief consideration of the exegesis of the passages with which he started. It will be seen

[1] *Das Auge der Einfalt: eine Untersuchung zu Matt.* 6, 22–23 *und Luk.* 11, 34–35 [1952]. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, xix. Munksgaard, Copenhagen, and Gleerup, Lund; Swedish, Kr. 10.

that we have here an excellent illustration of the way in which New Testament studies must rest on the Old, and also of the significance for the Old Testament student of works which at first sight lie outside his province. A large part of this work is devoted to the examination of the Old Testament passages where integrity of character in relation to God or man is presented. Thirteen pages of Bibliography end the work, save for the Index of Scripture passages.

Collected Essays of Théo Preiss. A volume of the collected essays of the late Théo Preiss has appeared under the title *Life in Christ*,[1] which will make plain the loss that theological scholarship sustained by the early death of this gifted scholar in 1950. There is an appreciation of the author by Roger Mehl at the beginning of the volume, and after a short essay on 'Suffering with Christ,' marked by a sense of robust realism combined with faith and devotion, the papers are arranged under the headings Biblical Theology, Exegesis, and Practical Theology. In the first section the longest paper is on 'The Imitation of Christ in Ignatius of Antioch,' while the shortest is that which supplies the title to the volume, 'Life in Christ and Social Ethics in the Epistle to Philemon.' In addition there are papers on 'Justification in Johannine Thought,' the 'Mystery of the Son of Man,' and on 'The Conception of History in the New Testament.' In the second section there are three papers. The first is short and argues for an Aramaic origin of Jn $8^{30\text{-}36}$; the second argues against the Synoptic view of the Last Supper as a Passover, but finds Passover motifs and Eschatological motifs entering together into the Supper; while the third deals with the question of the Baptism of Infants in the New Testament. In this last essay the author holds that the New Testament neither enjoins nor forbids the Baptism of Infants, but maintains that it has a value in a Christian family, but not in the family of non-believers, where it is without meaning, but thinks it well that there should be some Christian families which practise Adult Baptism. This paper was prepared for the Commission on Baptism of the Reformed Church of France. The last section contains four essays, of which those on 'The Task of the Church in the Nation,' and on 'Theological Teaching and the World' may be noted here. All the essays bear witness to the acute mind of the writer and not less to the fineness of his spirit.

[1] *Vie en Christ* [1952]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris; Swiss Fr. 7.80.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University

Contributions and Comments

The Present Participle of Antecedent Action—Some New Testament Instances[1]

The aorist participle is normally used to describe what takes place *before* the main verb. Occasionally, however, the present participle denotes action prior to that of the main verb, expressing usually in its context the continuous sense of the Imperfect Indicative. Admittedly these occurrences in the New Testament are few. One or two sometimes cited may be otherwise explained. On the other hand some instances not always recognized may be considered.

We begin with some doubtful cases:

Lk 23^{49}. Here the present participle (*αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι*) is probably substantival and virtually timeless: 'the women of his retinue.'[2] It is less likely that the participle represents antecedent action ('who followed him'). Cf. also 2 Jn[7] (*ἐρχόμενον*, 'Jesus Christ's coming').

Jn 9^{25}. The present participle *ὤν* may have the sense of the Imperfect ('I was blind'); the contrast implied by *ἄρτι* supports that view. The insertion of *ποτέ* (see below) would have made the usage more certain. As it is, the *ὤν* may be timeless ('a blind man').

Gal 1^{23}. The same ambiguity is seen here (*ὁ διώκων*, 'the former persecutor'). On the other hand the contrasted *ποτέ* and *νῦν* perhaps point to the Imperfect meaning ('he who was once persecuting us, now,' etc.).

Eph 4^{28} (*ὁ κλέπτων*), Rev 20^{10} (*ὁ πλανῶν*). Here perhaps the preference is for the substantival timeless use ('the thief,' 'the deceiver'), though both could carry the alternative (past) sense.

Jn 9^{8}. The *τὸ πρότερον* seems to support an Imperfect sense in *οἱ θεωροῦντες*, 'those who saw Him.' The same usage would be appropriate in *ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν*, though here the timeless sense is possible: 'is not this he who sits and begs?'

In the following passages the use of the present

[1] I am indebted to Professor C. F. D. Moule (Inaugural Lecture, *The Language of the New Testament*, 23, n. 1) for some of these references.

[2] Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc.* (p. 595), 'les femmes de sa suite.'

participle to denote action prior to that of the principal verb seems to be established :

Mt 2^{20}. *οἱ ζητοῦντες*, 'those who were seeking.'

Mt 4^{16}. *ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος*, 'the people who were sitting.'

Lk 2^{42}. *ἀναβαινόντων* represents the Imperfect in contrast with the Aorist (*τελειωσάντων*) : 'when they were going up . . . after they had fulfilled.'

Jn 12^{17}. *ὁ ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ*, '(the crowd) that was with him.'

Ac 4^{34}. *πωλοῦντες ἔφερον*, 'used to sell and bring.' Contrast 4^{37} (*πωλήσας*).

Ac 10^{7}. *ὁ λαλῶν*, 'he who was speaking.'

Ac 14^{21}. The sense requires us to take *εὐαγγελιζόμενοί* (A D *al.*) in the past sense. For the contrast with *μαθητεύσαντες* (aorist) see Lk 2^{42} (above) and Ac 27^{7}.

2 Co 11^{9}. *καὶ παρὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, 'and when I was present with you.' Similarly in 13^{2}.

1 P 3^{5}. *αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεόν*, 'who set their hope on God.'

In some instances the collocation of *ποτέ* or *πρότερον* with the present participle makes by contrast the Imperfect sense more necessary.[1]

Eph 2^{13}. *οἱ ποτε ὄντες*, 'who were formerly.'

Col 1^{21}. *ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας*.

1 Ti 1^{13}. *τὸ πρότερον ὄντα*.

The distribution of this usage in the New Testament suggests that it is a representative if somewhat rare locution. It would be interesting to explore the usage in the wider field of *κοινή* Greek.

H. G. Meecham

Hartley Victoria College, Manchester

ἐβάπτισα in Mark i. 8.

Besides the fact that I consider it of no value to distrust the accounts of the Gospels—regarding it as '*Gemeinde-Interpretation*'—and then to speculate on what John the Baptist originally would have said,[2] I want to comment here on a side-issue, raised by the Rev. H. J. Flowers in his contribution on '*ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί*.'[3]

He sees in the aorist *ἐβάπτισα*, used by Mark in 1^{8}, 'evidence of Semitic influence.' But 'the problems of the Greek tenses are not to be solved by an appeal to the Semitic influence.'[4]

The Authorized Version, James Moffatt and Edgar J. Goodspeed agree on the English perfect ('I have baptized') in translating *ἐβάπτισα*. The Revised Version, American Standard Version, and E. P. Gould,[5] retain the aorist ('I baptized'), while Ulfilas (in the Gothic Version : 'daupja') and Martin Luther (in the German Version : 'Ich taufe') apply the present.

It seems best to regard *ἐβάπτισα* as an instance of the so-called 'Timeless Aorist' and to translate it by the present : 'I baptize.' But, this use of the aorist is not to be ascribed to Hebrew influence. It is true that the timeless Hebrew perfect is much like this timeless aorist, but it is a common enough Greek idiom also. It occurs in Classical Greek,[6] in the *Κοινή*,[7] and survives still in Modern Greek.[8]

F. J. Botha

West Krugersdorp, South Africa

---

[1] W. W. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, p. 48 cites Thuc. iv. 3, *ἡ Πύλος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ ποτὲ οὔσῃ γῇ*, *Pylos is in the country which was once Messenia*, *οὔσῃ* is imperfect, and denotes time absolutely past, as is shown by *ποτέ*, without which it would be '*the country which is* (*now*) *Messenia*.'

[2] See also my *Ἁμαρτία in die Evangelie en die eerste Brief van die Apostel Johannes*, 15.

[3] The Expository Times, lxiv. [February 1953] 155.

[4] A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 822.

[5] *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (*I.C.C.*), *in loc.*

[6] Cf. *ἀπωλόμην* in Eur., *Alc.* 386 ; quoted by J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, i. 134.

[7] For example, *εὐδόκησα* (Mt 3^{17} 17^{5}, Mk 1^{11}, Lk 3^{22}) ; cf. also J. H. Moulton, *op. cit.*, 134 f. I add *ἠγάπησεν* (Jn 3^{16}, 1 Jn $4^{10.\ 11}$) and *ἠγάπησας* (Jn $17^{23.\ 24.\ 26}$).

[8] Cf. J. H. Moulton, *op. cit.*, 247.

Entre Nous

Religious Education : The Early Training of Children in Prayer and Worship. 1. Laying the Foundations

Archbishop Temple, in one of his early speeches about Christian Education, declared that it is not only useless but positively harmful to appeal to the logical understanding of a child while that understanding is still undeveloped. Instruction must be emotional and imaginative, and given through parable and precept. 'The logical element in religion,' he said, 'must be developed out of the emotional element and not before it, because it would stifle inquiry and paralyse imagination.'[1]

[1] F. A. Iremonger, *William Temple*, 92.

That quotation underlines the guiding principle in all that follows. In the early training of children in religion we need to be more concerned about what they *feel* than about what they *know*. If you examine the reasons people give in later life for abandoning the religion of their childhood you will find that most of them are simply rationalized emotion; a deep-rooted distaste provoked by the dullness, the boredom, the miserable restraint—sometimes, even, the thinly disguised humbug—that so often passes for religion. Sometimes, indeed, it may be a radical unwillingness to face the moral challenge of Christianity. Most ordinary arguments about religion are arguments about feelings and personal tastes rather than about theological truth. Very few people abandon religion on purely intellectual grounds. It is what we *feel*, not what we *know*, which determines what we *do*.

This simple fact (which is still not yet clearly enough recognized by parents and teachers) bears strongly on the religious training of young children. The most decisive thing we can do, during the first ten years of a child's life, is to put him in the way of gaining a happy and attractive impression of religion so that he may at least be favourably disposed towards it when the time comes for him to 'make up his mind' about it. He will then be in a position to face the intellectual and moral claims of the faith without prejudice, that is, without a distorted emotional attitude. We must try to give him an impression of religion which will appeal to all that is most natural and healthy in him, to his sense of fun as well as to his sense of obligation. It should be interesting to the point of fascination. It should be free from all unnecessary restraints and prohibitions, though it must at the same time demand a high degree of discipline. Most important, it should appeal at every stage to the child's ambition to be grown-up; that is, it should be forward-looking and adult in flavour, avoiding that kind of half-sentimental simplicity which some people think children like, though, in fact, it embarrasses them and confirms them in the idea that religion belongs to childhood and can be abandoned as they grow older.

This kind of religious education begins, for good or ill, with the very earliest impressions a baby receives in his cradle and builds up gradually into a 'sentiment' which, according to its emotional flavour, will one day largely determine whether the child is going to accept or reject the Christian faith. What a young child feels about religion is more important than what he knows about it. This should be obvious enough. A child only wants to know more about the things that interest him—and interest (the first business of all educators) is a matter of emotional attraction. If we can help children to associate religious experience with all the things they find most admirable and grown-up and worth taking trouble about, then they will ask all the right questions in their own good time and be ready to accept the answers.

How will all this work out in practice? Begin even before the child is born. No one can say how early the unborn child begins to receive impressions. He may be profoundly affected by his mother's states of mind during gestation; so his religious training may well begin as early as that, in the atmosphere of prayer and dedication with which his mother then surrounds him. This is an aspect of ante-natal care which is not taught in the clinics! 'Before thou camest forth out of the womb I called thee.'

As soon as the child is born his education begins in real earnest. At this stage it is impossible to differentiate between religious and any other kind of education—it is *all* religious. A child's first and most formative experience is his relationship with his mother. From this relationship he derives the complex of impressions which will later become his attitude to the world at large—and to God. To a tiny child his mother *is* God. She is the source and ground of his existence; she is Providence, supplying all his physical wants and giving him the security, comfort, and encouragement he needs. She is, in fact, his first glimpse of God, and the impression may be indelible. This is the first step in religious teaching—and to be aware of this will strongly influence our whole attitude to tiny babies. It is dangerous to imagine that babies are unimpressionable because they make no obvious response. They are sensitive to atmosphere and may be badly affected by quarrelling, or even by any kind of loose or ungenerous talk in their presence. It is always unwise to 'talk' in front of children, even tiny babies. In the same way we shall avoid any undue roughness or impatience in our ordinary handling of them. We can be firm without being ungentle.

The baby's first direct awareness of prayer as an explicit thing should be deliberately provided by the familiar sight of his father and mother (and perhaps older children) kneeling down by his cot, with hands together and eyes closed, and praying aloud. Let these external acts of prayer be quite openly demonstrated. In this way the baby is allowed from the very beginning of its life to enter into an overt experience of religion—to see and share in a religious act. Never mind how much he understands. He gets a happy impression of people he loves speaking together to Someone unseen whom they trust and revere, and he also gets the impression of prayer as something which grown-up people do naturally and regularly. As he grows older he will never be able to remember a time

when he was not aware of this attitude to prayer.

The next stage follows as a matter of course. In his own time and in his own way the child will begin to take part in these prayers—perhaps by putting his hands together and shutting one eye, or perhaps by vocal efforts of various kinds! So he begins to grow spontaneously into the life of prayer without any compulsion. Wait until he does before you attempt to take him further. Let him set the pace in his own way. '*See—Ask—Do*'—that is always the order in which young children learn.

Then, as he joins in more and more fully, let prayer times always continue as a common activity—praying *together*. Avoid any attitude or posture that places the child in a subordinate position. Let him feel that he is being allowed to take his part with you in a grown-up thing. This is the best argument against Prayers at Mother's Knee. This isolates him from grown-up people and accentuates his subservience, giving him the unspoken impression that prayers are for children. It may also obscure the fact that his prayers are addressed to God and not to his mother—and this may be even more disastrous if any stray aunt or uncle who happens to be staying for the week-end is casually invited to 'hear Tommy say his prayers.' The worst thing of all is to allow a child's prayer-time to degenerate into an entertaining spectacle for visitors. That will certainly be damaging both to the child and to his religion. The obvious thing is for mother and father (as well as any older children or visitors who may be allowed the *privilege* of taking part) to kneel down together, so that they all assume the same status, so to speak, in the presence of the unseen Father of all.

By such experiences as this the child will gradually come to recognize prayer as a perfectly normal part of everyday activity, as normal as baths and meals and play-times, and, above all, as something which grown-up people value.

JOHN G. WILLIAMS

Church of England Schools Council

'One of God's Merry Men'

Frederick Llewellyn Deane, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney from 1917 to 1943, had a most lovable personality and made many friends throughout his long life of eighty-three years. For these there has now been privately printed by Messrs. Blackwood a short biography (a hundred and sixteen octavo pages), and copies may be had from Canon Basil Millar, St. John's Rectory, 89 Crown Street, Aberdeen (5s. net). The author of the Memoir is Dr. W. G. Sinclair Snow, already known by his recent biography of Bishop Patrick Forbes.

In appearance Bishop Deane was slim and wiry. He was enthusiastic and gay. As his biographer says, it is refreshing and invigorating to recall a Bishop who was colourful and unconventional, and 'a man of light and leading.' He was an excellent raconteur and enjoyed a story against himself. One such concerned his fishing. 'He whipped off his fly and didn't know it. A visiting gillie spoke to his gillie and said, which the Bishop overheard, "Peter, your gentleman's lost his fly." Peter: "No matter, he is just as like to catch without a fly as with one."'

From 1904 to 1917 Deane was first Rector and later Provost of St. Mary's Episcopal Church, Glasgow. It was while he was there that this parish church was converted into a Cathedral Church, and, due to his tact, all the negotiations went through smoothly. A change in churchmanship was also effected without friction though he was not able to make the Sung Eucharist the chief service of the Lord's Day as he had done when he was Vicar of St. Andrew's, Leicester. Although his relations at Leicester, Glasgow, and Aberdeen with other churches were most friendly and he had a profound belief in the possibility of a reunion of the Presbyterian and Episcopal Church in Scotland his biographer says that he 'in no way compromised the Episcopalian position' and recalls that 'after a Faith and Order Conference at Hoddesdon, at which a well-known Canon of the Church of England had declared that he would have been ready to receive the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ at the hands of a Presbyterian minister, he observed with some force, "I am surprised that Canon —— feels that he could do that. I most certainly could not."'

On 31st May 1943, the Bishop resigned. The entry in his Diary was 'I am tired out.' 'I have greatly loved this City and Diocese, and all who dwell here,' he said in his farewell message.

He was 'one of God's Merry Men.' He taught that 'the life God had set before men was an adventure towards the infinite possibilities of His love and Christ had lighted the road. Away with dull care! We should be gay and good and glad.'

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION
FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA in THEOLOGY

The Wolsey Hall System of tuition by correspondence ensures that students receive individual attention from a group of highly qualified and experienced graduate tutors. Many ministers of all denominations have proved that a London University Degree is well within the powers of anyone of average ability, working at home under adequate guidance. The tuition fees are very reasonable, and may be spread over the period of the course.

Prospectus Free
from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D.,
Director of Studies, Dept. GE 42

WOLSEY HALL
OXFORD

Distinctive
Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your PRINTING and PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON
& G. W. BACON LTD.
LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

WHY NOT HAVE A DRINK—
IF YOU'RE A CHRISTIAN?

John Murray

'Readers will have no difficulty in inferring that the answer is emphatically in the negative. The evils of strong drink, and the case for total abstinence, are presented forcefully and persuasively, and the arguments are reinforced by some lively illustrations in line. Questions for discussion circles add to the usefulness of a book that should be in the hands of leaders of Christian work among young people.'—*The Christian.*

2s. 6d. net

THE FIBRES OF FAITH

A. Norman Rowland

The spread of the scientific temper during two generations in the minds of some has brought about a separation between Science and Religion. In these essays Mr. Rowland builds a sure philosophy on the accepted results of scientific endeavour and strengthens conviction in the Living God. Further, in a study and exposition of nature language in the Bible, he provides a fresh approach to the understanding of the 'miracle stories' through which we are called to see Jesus.

10s. 6d. net

P. T. FORSYTH
THE MAN AND HIS WORK

W. L. Bradley

'Ah! by Forsyth. One of the most brilliant minds in Europe,' said John Morley, then Vice-Chancellor of the University of Manchester—an agnostic, not given to exaggeration. Dr. Bradley is a Professor of Hartford Theological Seminary, and his book provides a conspectus of the theologian and his work.

18s. 6d. net

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.
MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON, E.C.4

NEW BOOK NEWS FROM THE R.E.P.

JESUS, LEADER OF MEN
A Study of the Claims of Jesus on Man and Society
By G. W. Butterworth, M.A., D.Litt.

A new 'Life of Jesus' that will appeal strongly to teachers and young people because of its directness, simplicity and strength.
'Dr. Butterworth has long been known as a teacher of teachers in the field of religious education. Now, through the printed word, he makes available to teachers everywhere much valuable help in presenting the claims of Jesus to pupils in upper forms, and young people in the churches generally.'—*British Weekly.*
Linson boards, 8s. 6d. net (postage 4d.)

JESUS AND HIS TEACHING
By Norman J. Bull, M.A.

Sixteen full chapters that cover the life of our Lord and expound His teaching as exemplified in His life.
'This is one of the best guide-books to religious knowledge which the 1944 Education Act has occasioned. It ought to find a wide use.'—*Church Times.*
'This book could have a use far beyond Day Schools. It would make a most excellent Bible Class Handbook; and still better, it could form the basis for an excellent series of instructional sermons. There is not a wasted word in it, and it is closely packed with the most useful material, especially in regard to the background of life and thought of the New Testament.'—*Expository Times.*
With maps and time-charts and a good index.
Linson boards, 7s. 6d. net (postage 4d.)

GOD'S WORLD
The Christian View of the Findings of Modern Science
By G. D. Yarnold, M.A., D.Phil.

'Although written for school use, this series may well prove valuable to grown-ups who have looked in vain for inexpensive books which will strengthen and confirm their faith and enable them to speak up for it in a world which largely rejects the Christian standpoint through ignorance.'—*Sheffield Diocesan Review.*
Limp cloth, 3s. net (postage 3d.)

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS LTD.
Wallington Surrey

Paul

MARTIN DIBELIUS

and

WERNER GEORG KUMMEL

'. . . we have here a really useful and illuminating book, and the frankly critical nature of its starting-point gives added weight to the substantial orthodoxy of its conclusions. Mr. Frank Clarke's translation reads naturally and elegantly.'—*Times Literary Supplement.*

'. . . a brilliant and highly original study.'—*Daily Telegraph.*

7s. 6d. net

Spiritual Authority in the Church of England

An Enquiry

Canon E. C. RICH

'The question "By What Authority" faces the Christian Church in an entirely new way today, when a sceptical attitude to all authoritative claims is increasingly prevalent. It is a question of peculiar importance to the Church of England . . .

Canon Rich calls his study an enquiry not a final solution . . . he has written a book that cannot be neglected by anyone seriously concerned with the problem of religious authority.'—*Times Literary Supplement.*

21s. net

LONGMANS

We can still supply the following in this well-known series:

HANDBOOKS FOR BIBLE CLASSES AND PRIVATE STUDENTS

COMMENTARIES:

Genesis	Principal Marcus Dods	4/-
Exodus, Vol. I	Dr. J. Macgregor	4/-
Exodus, Vol. II	Dr. J. Macgregor	4/-
Joshua	Principal G. C. M. Douglas	3/6
Judges	Principal G. C. M. Douglas	3/6
Chronicles	Professor J. G. Murphy	3/6
Job	Rev. J. Aitken	3/6
Obadiah to Zephaniah	Prin. G. C. M. Douglas	3/6
Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi	Prin. Marcus Dods	4/-
St. Matthew	Principal E. E. Anderson	4/6
St. Mark	Principal T. M. Lindsay	4/6
St. Luke, Vol. I	Principal T. M. Lindsay	5/6
St. Luke, Vol. II	Principal T. M. Lindsay	4/6
St. John, Vol. I	Dr. G. Reith	4/6
St. John, Vol. II	Dr. G. Reith	4/6
Acts, Vol. I	Principal T. M. Lindsay	4/6
Acts, Vol. II	Principal T. M. Lindsay	4/6
Romans	Principal D. Brown	4/6
Galatians	Dr. J. Macgregor	3/6
Ephesians	Professor J. S. Candlish	3/6
Colossians	Dr. S. R. Macphail	3/6
Pastoral Epistles	Dr. J. P. Lilley	4/6
Hebrews	Professor A. B. Davidson	4/6
Revelation	Dr. J. T. Dean	4/-

GENERAL SUBJECTS:

Israel's Golden Age	Prof. J. D. Fleming	3/6
From Exile to Advent	Dr. W. Fairweather	6/-
Life of Christ	Dr. J. Stalker	3/6
Life of Paul	Dr. J. Stalker	4/6
Lessons on the Life of Jesus	Rev. W. Scrymgeour	4/6
The Times of Christ	Dr. L. A. Muirhead	4/-
The Teaching of Jesus	Dr. D. M. Ross	4/-
The Christian Miracles	Rev. W. D. Thomson	4/-
The Christian Sacraments	Prof. J. S. Candlish	3/6
The Christian Doctrine of God	Professor J. S. Candlish	3/6
Foundation Truths	Professor J. Laidlaw	3/6
Sum of Saving Knowledge	Rev. J. Macpherson	3/6
Butler's Three Sermons	Prof. T. B. Kilpatrick	4/6
Westminster Confession	Rev. J. Macpherson	5/-
The Shorter Catechism	Prin. Alex. Whyte.	4/6
The Reformation	Principal T. M. Lindsay	4/6
Principles of Protestantism	Dr. J. P. Lilley	4/6
Presbyterianism	Rev. J. Macpherson	4/6
Church and State	Dr. A. Taylor Innes	5/-
History of Christian Missions	Dr. George Smith	4/6

38 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH, 2

T. & T. CLARK

EPWORTH SECONDHAND BOOKS

Established 1747

Specialists in Theological Books

ENQUIRIES INVITED

25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 19s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£10, 10s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*